Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XXV, Nos. 4 & 5. JULY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
ASSISTANT EDITOR: M. T. DUNLOP, M.A.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Our Church Authorities and Marriage Problems	169
Professor MacBride's Challenge .. .. .. The Editor.	177
Erastus and Erastianism .. .. J. F. Clayton, M.C., M.A.	182
The Ascension: A Re-interpretation .. .. A. E. N. Hitchcock, M.A.	190
The Travels of Pietro della Valle in India, 300 Years Ago .. .. J. M. Macfie, D.D.	198
Religious Conditions in Austria .. .. .. G. H. D. Grimes, M.A., F.R.G.S.	205
The Interpretation of the Creeds .. .. T. J. Wood, M.A.	214
The New Background of Christian Thought .. T. Wigley, M.A.	220
Lawrence of Arabia .. .. L. B. Cross, M.A.	236
Book Reviews	242
Correspondence	270

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET
Price 2/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

AMERICAN AGENT:
MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

All literary contributions should be addressed to:—
The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford.

All orders for advertisements should be addressed to:—A. DARBY'S ADVERTISING SERVICE, Cobham House, 24-26 Water Lane, London, E.C. 4. (Telephone: City 6686-7).

Published on the 15th of every month except August, September and October. A Triple Number is published in October.

AMERICAN CHURCHMEN

In sympathy with progressive aims are invited to subscribe to

'THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'

The Magazine for one year
$3.00

Communicate with—

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY,
1423 Linden Avenue,
Baltimore, Maryland.

SOUTH DEVON.—A Lady has Sitting Room, Three Bedrooms to Let in her house, October and onwards. Ideal for Winter. Every modern comfort. Near Sea, Country, Phone, Bus Route. Moderate terms.—Apply, MISS WILSON, Blueberry Cottage, Avondale Road, Littleham Cross, near Exmouth.

READERS of the *Modern Churchman* are asked to support our advertisers, and to mention the *Modern Churchman* when replying to advertisements in our pages.

A LIBRARY OF THEOLOGY

R. H. CHARLES
COURAGE, TRUTH, PURITY

HASTINGS RASHDALL
PRINCIPLES AND PRECEPTS
IDEAS AND IDEALS
GOD AND MAN

LEONARD HODGSON
REASON IN CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC

C. F. RUSSELL
RELIGION AND NATURAL LAW

C. C. J. WEBB
A CENTURY OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

J. C. McNAUGHT
THE CELTIC CHURCH AND THE SEE OF PETER

THOMAS ALLISON
PIONEERS OF ENGLISH LEARNING
LECTURES IN CHURCH HISTORY

Cloth, 3s. 6d. net each

BASIL BLACKWELL : OXFORD

ABAILARD'S ETHICS

Translated with an Introduction by
J. RAMSEY McCALLUM, M.A.
Rector of Eversden, Cambridge
Foreword by KENNETH E. KIRK, D.D.
Cloth, 6s. net

¶ "The Author is to be congratulated on a most felicitous translation, and thanked for a very interesting and lucid introduction." *The Expository Times*

THE STORY OF THE RELICS OF THE PASSION

By H. M. GILLETT
Illustrated, Cloth, 4s. 6d. net

¶ ". . . a careful account . . ." *The Guardian*

THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND GREATER HOLY DAYS OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

A New Translation, together with a selection of New Prayers
By The REV. T. F. ROYDS, B. D.
Cloth, 2s. 6d. net

¶ "The rendering witnesses so generally both to accurate scholarship and to a deft command of simple yet dignified English that it not only deserved but almost requires the careful study of every parish priest." *The Gardian*

WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY'S
LIFE OF ST. WULSTAN
BISHOP OF WORCESTER
Now rendered into English by J. H. F. PEILE
Archdeacon of Worcester
Cloth, 6s. net

¶ "Archdeacon Peile's pleasant translation should ensure an even greater circle of readers for a delightful book." *The Times Literary Supplement*

PAPAL PROVISIONS

ASPECTS OF CHURCH HISTORY, CONSTITUTIONAL, LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE, IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES
By GEOFFREY BARRACLOUGH, M.A.
Cloth, 10s. 6d. net

¶ "Learned, sincere and provocative in the best sense of the word." *Cambridge Review*

METHOD IN YOUR PRAYERS

By A. F. THORNHILL, M.A.
Author of *Family Prayers*
2s. 6d. net

CATHOLIC REUNION

AN ANGLICAN PLEA. By J. T. PLOWDEN-WARDLAW
2s. 6d. net

BASIL BLACKWELL - OXFORD

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 4 & 5. JULY AND AUGUST, 1935. VOL. XXV.

OUR CHURCH AUTHORITIES AND MARRIAGE PROBLEMS

By THE EDITOR.

IN sexual questions the Church of England is regarded by many English people, particularly young people, as hopelessly out of touch with reality. The Church's prolonged struggle to prevent the marriage of the deceased wife's sister; the Church's refusal to sanction the termination of married relationships which the horrors of lunacy, syphilis, crime, cruelty or prolonged desertion have ruined; the Church's silence and inertia in the face of dysgenic marriages; the Church's refusal to distinguish between the innocent and the guilty party where the civil courts have granted divorce with the right of re-marriage; have done much in the public mind to discredit the Church, not only intellectually, but morally.

We are glad to observe that the recently issued report of the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York (entitled *The Church and Marriage*)[1] will certainly help to remove this disastrous and detrimental impression. The body of bishops and distinguished clergymen whose reasoned conclu-

[1] Published by the S.P.C.K., price 2/6 net (June 1935).

sions are here given certainly point to a more understanding and sensitive appreciation of our marriage problems, and a readiness, if possible without the sacrifice of principle and loyalty to Christ, to assent to, if not ardently to advocate, urgent remedies. The old *non possumus* attitude, so hopeless and so irritating, has been abandoned. Modern-minded men and women may not agree with the conclusions of the Church's authorities but at least they will recognize in those conclusions some measure of open-mindedness, though it be limited by timidities and traditions. They will also recognize that the practical proposals to which it may be assumed the Church authorities will agree, when they have finally completed their consideration of the subject, will show a very marked advance upon anything advocated hitherto by the Church's rulers.

The Report, and this is most gratifying, does recognize our Lord as the Divine Revealer of supreme moral and spiritual principles and ideals, not merely as a legislator or second Moses. It recognizes, as a consequence, that it is the function of the Christian Church to inculcate these principles and ideals and to strive to raise Christian practice progressively towards their realization. It recognizes that so far as England is concerned, at the present time, it is impracticable to demand that the civil law shall be in harmony in all respects with Christ's ideal of marriage. All that may reasonably be hoped for is that the civil legislation shall be of such a kind as to give support to that ideal and not to deny it or flout it. The Report also recognizes that in the case of divorce and re-marriage, both parties are not necessarily guilty and that the Church authorities should make every effort to assess the guilt and to secure that the innocent party shall not be subjected to the same degree of Church discipline as the guilty party.

The Report is ready to sanction by way of nullity (not by divorce) the termination of the marriage contract in cases of insanity, syphilis and other defects. The Report recognizes the existence of dysgenic marriages and the obligation of the Church to discourage them, at least by its teaching.

The Report also recognizes that the Church of England in this matter of marriage and divorce is not bound by the Roman Canon Law but that, as a national Church, she is free, in obedi-

ence to the principles of Christ, to frame her own policy for the practical realization of those principles.

The Report urges strongly the need for reform in the present method of procedure for the procuring of divorce in our civil courts. The purpose of such reform being to reduce, if not to abolish, the large amount of collusion and perjury which is commonly believed to find a place in those proceedings whereby the distinction between guilty and innocent parties is hopelessly obscured.

Many may feel that the Church authorities are not prepared to go as far as they ought to go in the direction of Marriage Reform and that they have failed to deal with certain serious problems which, in the interests of the moral welfare of the nation, ought to be faced. Nevertheless, they must feel thankful that the authorities of the Church of England have made a very real and distinct advance which promises, as it proceeds, to bring about the co-operation, both within and outside the Church, of the great majority of persons of good will who are not anti-Christian in their views of sexual relationship, but anti-ecclesiastical, because they have felt that neither the Spirit of Christ nor the lessons of modern scientific experience have been in this sphere reflected in the Church's practice and precepts.

The 115 pages of the Report contain much of interest and value which we cannot deal with here. We are compelled to confine attention to the main conclusions at which the members of the joint committees have arrived. These conclusions take the form of three Reports. (1) The Majority Report; (2) The first Minority Report signed by the Bishop of Birmingham, the Bishop of Barking (Dr. Inskip), the Dean of Hereford (Dr. Waterfield), and Canon Guy Rogers; (3) A second Minority Report signed by the Bishop of Norwich. The conclusions of the Majority Report are summarized in the following Resolutions which it was proposed to move at the recent meeting of the Convocation of Canterbury. Circumstances only permitted the opening Resolutions to be dealt with.

1. That this House affirms as our Lord's principle and standard of marriage a lifelong and indissoluble union for better or for worse of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side.

2. That this House also affirms its belief that, as a consequence, in no circumstances can Christian men or women re-marry during the

lifetime of a wife or husband without a breach of the moral principles by which the institution of marriage is governed according to Christ's teaching.

3. That in order to maintain the principle of a lifelong obligation clearly expressed in the Marriage Service, (*a*) the Church should not allow the use of that Service in the case of anyone who has a partner still living; and (*b*) any person who has re-married contrary to the second of the above Resolutions ought not to be admitted to the Sacraments and privileges of the Church except on such conditions as the Church may require.

4. That while affirming its adherence to the ancient tradition of the Western Church, as stated in the first and second of the above Resolutions, this House recognizes that the actual discipline of particular Christian communions in this matter has varied widely from time to time and place to place, according to the needs or distresses of the moment; and holds that the Church of England is competent to enact such a discipline of its own in regard to marriage (as in other cases) as may from time to time appear most salutary and efficacious.

5. That accordingly, after due consideration of all the factors involved, this House maintains that the most salutary form of discipline applicable to the circumstances of the day, which can be adopted by the Church of England, is as follows:—Where under the present English law as to divorce and re-marriage two persons have contracted a legal marriage during the lifetime of a former partner of one of them the bishop shall be informed of all the circumstances of the case, and if he be satisfied *that the parties have acted in all good conscience, and after mature reflection,* and that for them to abide as husband and wife in a marriage so contracted is, in the circumstances, morally preferable to any other course, and that no other impediment stands in the way, he shall be free to give directions that they may be admitted to the Sacraments.

6. That serious consideration should be given to the question of the desirability of amending the present law of nullity by the addition of such grounds as the following for declaring a marriage null and void: (1) Where either party is to his or her own knowledge, and unknown to the other, suffering from venereal disease, or certain other disorders to be specified; (2) where a party knows of and has concealed from the other the existence of some notable hereditary mental or physical disorder in his or her family, likely to be detrimental to the happiness of the marriage or the health of the children; (3) where the woman knows and conceals from the man that she is at the time of the marriage pregnant by some other man; (4) where there has been wilful refusal to consummate the marriage.

7. That it is desirable that the Table of Kindred and Affinity should be revised.

8. That while convinced that Christ's standard of a lifelong and indissoluble union provides the only sure ground on which to base the relations of man and woman in marriage, and that the Church should therefore commend that standard as the true foundation for legislation by the State, this House nevertheless recognizes that its full legal enactment may not always be possible in a State which comprises all sorts

and kinds of people, including many who do not accept the Christian way of life or the means of grace which the Church offers to its members.

9. That it is urgently desirable that steps should be taken to strengthen the safeguards against the methods of collusion and perjury which are at the present time not uncommonly employed in seeking to secure decrees of divorce.

10. That this House, recognizing that some amendment of the State law relating to grounds of divorce is demanded by the circumstances of the day, is of opinion that the Church should be ready to give consideration to proposals for such amendment, provided that any proposed amendment does not tend to make marriage a temporary alliance or to undermine the foundations of family life.

11. That whatever ground or grounds of divorce the State may add to the ground already allowed by the law of England, it is essential that the rights of the Church in relation to its own members should be fully secured in all legislation with regard to divorce; and that in particular the Church should be free (1) to forbid the use of its buildings for any marriage when one of the parties has his or her former partner still living; and (2) to make its own regulations for the admission of such persons to the Sacraments and other privileges of the Church.

12. That the law which permits the use of the Marriage Service after a Civil Marriage should be amended so as to provide for the omission of those parts of the Marriage Service which are not appropriate for the religious ceremony after the civil contract, but that this privilege should not be extended to any person who has been a party to a divorce suit.

13. That the clergy of the Church should be encouraged to give regular and careful instruction within their parishes, both publicly and privately, on the nature of holy matrimony, its responsibilities, and the mutual love and forbearance which it requires.

The best that can be said for these proposals has already been said. They do not go very far, nevertheless they are a distinct advance upon anything the Church of England has hitherto achieved in its attitude towards the problems of marriage and divorce.

The proposals of the first Minority Report are to our mind of a much more cheering and courageous character and run as follows :—

1. That this House affirms that, according to God's will declared by Christ, marriage involves a moral and spiritual bond between one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side, which is indissoluble save by death.

2. That this House takes account of the fact that it cannot be said to be decided beyond all doubt that Christ's statement did not contain the exception, 'saving only for the cause of fornication.'

3. That this House also takes account of the fact that, both in the past and at the present time, New Testament scholars of the first rank have held the view that, while declaring the supreme ideal of marriage according to the Mind of God, Christ did not give to His followers a legal pronouncement, but, on the contrary, recognized the right of Moses to legislate for his people in his age, and in this, as in other matters, left men to legislate for themselves according to the needs of their time.

4. That this House, therefore, affirms that all Christian treatment of matrimonial questions and problems should have regard both to the primary principle stated in Resolution 1 and to the considerations set forth in Resolutions 2 and 3.

5. That this House recognizes that the actual discipline of particular Christian Communions, that of the Eastern Orthodox Church from early times, and that of some Protestant Communions in post-Reformation days, has, as regards matrimonial questions, varied widely from time to time and from place to place according to the needs and distresses of the moment; and holds that the Church of England is competent to enact such a discipline of its own in regard to marriage (as in other matters) as may from time to time appear most salutary and efficacious.

6. That, while it is of the utmost importance to keep before Christian people the divine ideal declared by Christ, this House recognizes that there are cases of the dissolution of a marriage in which one party is known beyond all doubt to be entirely innocent; and holds that in such cases the Church should not stretch its discipline to the point of declaring that the dissolution of the marriage was wrong, or that the innocent person rendered himself or herself excommunicate if he or she contracted another marriage in the lifetime of the offending partner.

7. That when two persons have contracted a legal marriage in the lifetime of a former partner of one of them, and either of such persons, wishing to receive Holy Communion, cannot fully satisfy the priest that he or she may be admitted to the Sacrament under the provision of Resolution 6, the priest shall refer the case to the bishop of the diocese, informing the party concerned that he is doing so.

8. That, provided that a generous treatment is accorded to such cases as clearly deserve it under the provision of Resolution 6, it is essential that the Church should be free (1) to forbid the use of its buildings for any marriage when of either of the parties the partner of a former marriage is still living; and (2) to make its own regulations for the admission of such persons to the Sacrament and other privileges of the Church.

9. That the freedom of the Church expressed in Resolution 8 should be fully secured in any future legislation with regard to divorce.

10. That, provided that such freedom be fully secured, the Church should be ready to give unprejudiced consideration to proposals for adding other ground or grounds of divorce to the ground already allowed by the law of England.

11. That it is urgently desirable that steps should be taken to strengthen the safeguards against the methods of collusion and perjury which are at the present time not uncommonly employed in seeking to secure decrees of divorce.

These proposals will receive the support of Modern Churchmen generally and constitute in a positive manner the just criticism to which they feel the proposals of the Majority Report may be rightly subjected.

We are inclined to hold that Resolution 2 is superfluous. The phrase 'it cannot be said to be decided beyond all doubt' is to make a demand for the conclusions of textual and higher criticism which the nature of those branches of research precludes. The conclusions of criticism may in some cases appear to be a baseless assumption; in others a mere presumption; in others a possibility; in others a probability; in other cases a conclusion of the highest probability; but we cannot with security place any conclusion as 'beyond all doubt.' 'Probability is the very guide of life' said the great Bishop Butler, and probability is our guide also in the sphere of textual and literary criticism.

We should have liked to see the first Minority Report tackle the problem of 'separations.' Mr. Claud Mullins has pointed out the great seriousness of this problem at the present time. For every divorce granted there are four separations granted, and each separation, inasmuch as the persons separated are not allowed to marry again, becomes a source of moral danger to the community, which danger is largely obviated in the case of divorce which carries with it the right to marry again. In this connection it may be worth while to note that Mr. Claud Mullins[2] has proved practically that reform in the method of hearing appeals for separation can often be effective in securing a reconciliation, and that possibly some similar change in the method of hearing divorce cases might be productive of equally beneficial and happy results. There can be little doubt that the extension by the State of the grounds of divorce might do much to reduce the number of separations, and by allowing the parties to marry again improve the moral life of the community.

Resolution 6, which makes reference to the 'innocent' party in a divorce suit, is not to be interpreted as identifying the innocent party with the innocent party in a civil suit for divorce. In divorce suits it is only too well known by solicitors and barristers

[2] See *Wife v. Husband in the Courts*. George Allen and Unwin. Price 3/6. 1935.

that the 'innocent' party is often very far from innocent. It would be the business of the Church authorities to settle this question of innocence where the party in question desires to participate in the privileges of full Church membership. Of course it may be argued that the Church authority, preferably the parish priest, could probably only secure an *ex parte* statement. Nevertheless he would in many ways be in a much better position to decide rightly the question of innocence than if his decision were based upon the findings of the divorce court.

The second Minority Report registers the views of the Bishop of Norwich in the matter of the institution of 'universal civil preliminaries' before the solemnization of marriage in Church. There is much to be said for the advantages of the Bishop's contention, and not least that it would place the Church and the Dissenters on the same level in this matter. The objections urged by the Majority Report against this proposal do not seem to us convincing. The loss of some £25,000 in fees by chancellors, registrars and surrogates is not one that ought to count. There is no sound reason for believing that the institution of 'universal civil preliminaries' would do anything to secularize the idea of marriage and reduce the number of marriages solemnized in Church. For instance, in New Zealand, where this method prevails, it is not possible we believe to point to any such detrimental results.

While supporting the proposal of the Bishop of Norwich, we should be sorry to be supposed to be identified with his views on Biblical criticism, which are frankly fundamentalist.

We welcome *The Church and Marriage* because it marks a better understanding between Churchmen of the right and left wings. They are still apart, but each side have made important concessions in this document. It is much that the right wing accept and acknowledge our Lord as a revealer of Divine Principles; it is much that Churchmen of the left wing are willing to concede freedom to the Church authorities in the last resort not to act against their consciences in obedience to the State.

Of course the differences between right wing and left wing Churchmen are not merely superficial nor easily bridged. Aristotle's saying that 'although men differ about small things, the reasons for their differences are never small' is profoundly true

here. The underlying conviction of the framers of the Majority Report is reflected in one of their *obiter dicta*. 'The Church has a law to declare and a discipline to exercise for its members' (p. 18).

The left wing Churchman doubts this. He regards that Church ideal as a product of the spirit of Jewish legalism and Roman Imperialism. It began with St. Paul, the Jewish Rabbi and Roman citizen, but is it part of the Gospel of Jesus? There is no evidence that it is. Jesus is reported as having said, 'Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.' The duty of the Church, after the example of Christ, is to proclaim ideals and principles and call on men to accept them and live by them—but the Church has no disciplinary authority, derived from Christ, to enforce a legal system of pains and penalties.

If this conclusion be correct the Church will excommunicate no one; but its members will in certain cases excommunicate themselves.

> 'They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us.'[3]

Their practice was in such hopeless opposition to the Church's spirit and teaching that they felt compelled to separate themselves from her. No Church courts, no judicial sentences, no ecclesiastical exclusions were needed. They who could not abide in the company of the disciples withdrew from the circle of light into the outer darkness.

PROFESSOR MACBRIDE'S CHALLENGE

The following letter by the veteran scientist, Professor MacBride, was published in the *Times* of June 25:

> Sir,—In your issue of June 13 there appeared a most interesting letter from Prebendary Carlile. In this letter the Prebendary cites the Archbishop of Canterbury as calling on the people in every parish to form groups in order to testify to 'the reality of Christ,' and he quotes a very similar admonition on the part of the Archbishop of York.
>
> Perhaps you would allow a scientific man who has a warm sympathy for the work of the Church to give expression to some of the difficulties which occur to him when he contemplates the carrying out of these admonitions.

[3] *I John* ii, 19.

It seems to me to be an essential pre-requisite that the Archbishops should define what exactly they mean by the term 'Christianity.' No educated man can deny that in historic Christianity there is a temporary element as well as one of permanent value, and as time goes on the temporary element becomes more and more untenable. Even if, as the Catholic party desire, we could get back to the thoughts and feelings of 1,600 years ago the problem would not be solved, for the early Church looked out on a totally different universe from that which we contemplate to-day. Its members lived in a world of signs and wonders which were direct interpositions of the Almighty in human affairs, and they were in the immediate expectation of a fiery end of the present order of things.

We, on the contrary, live in a world of all-pervading law, of regularly recurring phenomena, and miracles, even when well attested, turn out to be only instances of long-period natural happenings (*cf.* the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the drying up of the Jordan so that the Israelites could cross over it). The so-called 'end of the world' has receded to a period millions of years hence; in fact, the world has the greater part of its life still to come.

All the old dogmas require redefinition in order to adapt them to the new mental atmosphere. Until sixty years ago scientific thought had touched only a small minority of the people, but now popular education has become widespread; the latest scientific ideas are incorporated in the text-books used by elementary school children, and the most 'sensational' scientific results are broadcast by wireless all over Christendom.

As a consequence, as is confirmed by the testimony of Christians of every denomination, the interest of the younger generation in historic Christianity is rapidly diminishing. The churches are largely carried on by middle-aged people. Mere emotional outbursts will not restore the old state of affairs. The intellectual foundations of the faith must be examined and re-established, for, as Huxley once said, 'Right practice depends on right theory.'

Yours faithfully,

West Bank, Alton, Hants. E. W. MacBride.

To this modest and pertinent letter the Archbishop of York replied as follows in the *Times* of June 28:

Sir,—It might seem discourteous to leave unnoticed the friendly letter of Professor MacBride which appeared in your issue of June 25. I could wish that the Professor had given us some illustration of his contention that 'All the old dogmas require re-defintion in order to adapt them to the new mental atmosphere.'

There are very few Christian dogmas, and of most of them, at least, it can be safely affirmed that they owe very little to the 'mental atmosphere' of any age. The Professor refers to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and to the drying-up of the Jordan. These are not the subject-matter of any dogma.

Of course it is true that the presentation of Christian dogma needs, and has in the successive generations received, perpetual modifications; and many theological opinions current in the nineteenth century have

no title to currency in the twentieth. Our own best readjustments of exposition will be largely discarded by our successors. But Christianity remains recognizably one throughout these variations.

On the other hand, nothing, as I think, could be more disastrous from the Professor's own point of view than an authoritative declaration by ecclesiastical authorities of 'what exactly they mean by the term "Christianity."' Unless infallibility be claimed, that aim must be abandoned. Professor MacBride is specially concerned about the problem of how to relate acceptance of the scientific view of the world and its belief in 'all-pervading law' with faith in the living God. I am sure he does not think that progress in the solution of that difficulty could be assisted by an archiepiscopal definition.

What is wanted is co-operative study in which we help one another to build up the new synthesis for which the world is waiting, and, in the meantime, to present what any of us believe to be essential Christian truth in the manner that will least expose it to criticism either for failure to take note of scientific knowledge and (more important) of the scientific outlook, or for neglect of the deliverances of religious experience. Such mutual assistance in study and in exposition or teaching is a main aim of the recently-founded Institute of Christian Education, to which you, Sir, gave prominence lately. Professor MacBride has called attention to a real need, though I cannot endorse his method of meeting it; the Institute will, as I hope, be far more effective.

Yours faithfully,

Bishopthorpe, York, *June 26th*. WILLIAM EBOR:

All Modernists will accept with gratitude the Archbishop's affirmation of the evolutionary character of Christian dogma and his conviction that the essential dogmas of the Christian religion are very few. They would, however, have been deeply grateful if the Archbishop had stated what those few essential dogmas are, and had pointed out how they can be proved by the testimony of Christian experience. This, we take it, was what Professor MacBride really wished to elicit.

We recognize that it would require a large amount of courage to do this on the part of an English Archbishop to-day, and very many people belonging to different Christian denominations would probably criticize the Archbishop's statements severely both because of the fewness of the essential dogmas selected and because the Archbishop's selection did not include some highly valued dogmas which they regard as essential. Although the Archbishop modestly recognizes that such a statement made by himself would probably be regarded as out of date a few years hence, yet that does not seem to us to be a sound reason for not making such a statement. Christian teachers

who are not infallible, and who know themselves not to be infallible, are yet required to teach both in season and out of season, and may not rightly plead the almost certain imperfection and fallibility of their teaching as a reason for not giving it. The greater the position of the Christian teacher the more incumbent is it for him to provide short and simple answers to short and difficult questions. If Christian laymen, in our English parishes, may rightly be called upon to bear public testimony to the truth of the Christian religion, not simply by their character and conduct but by verbal teaching, it may properly be asked: What is it in the Christian religion that they should testify to as true, and what is the evidence which they have found able to convince them of its truth?

It is this element in the Christian religion to which the Archbishop refers as constituting Christianity 'recognizably one' notwithstanding the numerous variations which its dogmas have presented in successive ages.

If our Church leaders could be induced to do what Professor MacBride desires, they would clear the way for a great unification of Christian forces and a great recovery of English people to the Christian religion. Dr. Temple, like Dr. MacBride, knows that many things which we all at one time regarded as essentials of the Christian religion have been discredited by modern scientific and historic research. Many people regard these things as essentials of the Christian religion to-day, but inasmuch as they cannot believe them, they have deserted the Christian Church. It appears to us that Professor MacBride recognizes, not as an enemy of the Christian religion, but as a friend, the need for such authoritative action.

If only Dr. Temple would frankly and courageously state this, not in general terms, but explicitly, he would be performing a great service to the Christian cause in this land at the present time. Lesser men may do this, but if our Archbishops would do it, the nation at large, not merely some ecclesiastical or non-ecclesiastical group within it, would take heed.

Richard Baxter, the saint of Puritanism, attempted to do this some two hundred and fifty years ago in what for him was a remarkably brief treatise on the *Unreasonableness of Infidelity*. Tertullian, one of the most influential Fathers of the Western

Church, also did it shortly after 200 A.D. in what we believe is the briefest of his treatises, *Concerning the Testimony of the Soul*. The appeal to the witness of Christian experience is as old as Christianity itself; but what can and does this evidence prove to be true in the Christian religion? None of the things for which men and women are deserting the Christian Church to-day because they cannot believe them; and, we may add also, none of the things which to-day are dividing the Christian Churches from one another.

Dr. Dearmer in his recent Essex Hall Lecture, *Christianity as a New Religion*,[1] stresses this point with vigour and cogency.

> 'The religion of Christ, His message or Gospel, is:—
>
> 1. The Kingdom of God.
> 2. The Fatherhood of God.
> 3. The Brotherhood of Man.
> 4. Eternal Life' (p. 43).

This Christian Quadrilateral, in the light of New Testament critical research, is a much truer representative of the original Gospel of Jesus than is the Lambeth Quadrilateral. It ranks with the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes and the Two Great Commandments, but according to Dr. Dearmer such qualifications will not commend it to the ecclesiastical mind. The tendency of that mind is to keep on offering to God, not what Jesus Christ declared was His Will, but all sorts of ecclesiastical substitutes for it — substitutes which we see to-day are as much discredited at the bar of historical research and modern science as they are at the bar of a rightly interpreted Christian experience.

> 'The message of Christ unperverted is a new religion. Can we state it in a sentence? The most central and certain point is the doctrine of universal love; and the rest is the content of that doctrine' (p. 41 *f*).

This conception of what constitutes Christianity is much too simple, much too profound, much too practical, much too difficult to realize in action, much too incredible in the face of the suffering visible in the creative process, for the vast majority of us, whether Christians or non-Christians, to accept as true. Hence the substitution of the ecclesiastical backstairs for the narrow way.

[1] Published by The Lindsay Press, price 1/- (1935).

ERASTUS AND ERASTIANISM

By the Rev. J. F. Clayton, Reader at the Temple Church; Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at Ripon Hall, Oxford, and S. Boniface College, Warminster.

IF a candidate for an ecclesiastical appointment were to say that he was an Erastian, that confession would probably ruin his chances if the electors were clerics, and perhaps improve his prospects if they were laymen of a legal turn of mind. Yet if the electors were asked to explain what Erastianism means and why it is so called, possibly neither those to whom it is detestable nor those to whom it is delectable could give an answer.

Erastianism is named after Thomas Erastus, a distinguished doctor of medicine who was born in 1524, held a professorial chair at Heidelburg from 1558 to about 1577, and died at Basel in 1583; he wrote one treatise on ecclesiastical subjects known as *De Excommunicatione* and many on questions connected with medicine. His religious opinions can be studied in this treatise (written in Latin and not easy to be obtained), and those who want to know more about his life and work will find an interesting account of him by the late Dr. Figgis in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for 1901. Erastus belongs to the second stage of the Reformation period when there was a deep cleavage between the Lutheran (or Protestant) and the Reformed Churches; among the Reformed Churches there was a further division between those on the Zwinglian model at Zurich and those on the model of Calvin's church at Geneva. By the treaty of Augsburg (1555) each of the princes within the Holy Roman Empire could choose either Catholicism or Lutheran Protestantism as the religion of his state; the 'Reformed' churches were not officially recognized, though in the Palatinate of which Heidelburg was the capital a Reformed church was able to exist for a time.

The distinction between Zwinglianism and Calvinism was not only over the nature of the Lord's Supper, but also over Church discipline. Calvinism insisted that the Church is independent of the State and desired to have a court of ministers

and ecclesiastically-minded laymen to exercise an inquisitorial discipline over Church members; the Zwinglian churches in the small Swiss cantons tended to mingle Church and State, and at Zurich there was no such disciplinary court as Calvin had established at Geneva. When Erastus accepted a professorship of medicine at Heidelburg in 1558, the Elector was a tolerant Lutheran; the next Elector was a Calvinist in doctrine who, however, seems to have preferred the easier discipline of Zurich. Erastus himself was a Zwinglian both in doctrine and in his dislike of clerical control.

In 1568 an English refugee, aspiring to a doctorate, presented a thesis maintaining that a Church reformed on the best model should have a presbytery of ministers and godly laymen to decide on the fitness of intending communicants. In a preface to his treatise *De Excommunicatione* many years later Erastus complained that about this time Heidelburg was afflicted by a *febris excommunicatoria*, but at the moment he regarded the matter only as an academic dispute except that the supporters of the Calvinist aspirant to the doctorate called their opponents *profani*, *Satanici*, *diabolici*, *turbatores*, *hostes pietatis*, *phanatici*, etc. Later on he felt that the matter was more serious and made some comments in the form of a hundred theses which, however, he did not publish.

Dr. Figgis states that the godly discipline was established at Heidelburg and that an unsuccessful attempt was made to excommunicate Erastus. Then in 1576 a new Elector succeeded who was a strict Lutheran; he required all professors to sign a Lutheran formula or resign; Erastus would not submit to such State interference with the rights of conscience, so he retired to Basel, where he became a professor of ethics and died on the last day of 1583. At the time of his death he was preparing for publication his theses on Excommunication (reduced to 75), together with a *Confirmatio Thesium*; the volume appeared a few years later.

The title of the Theses is, *An examination of the very pressing (gravissima) question whether Excommunication, so far as it repels from the sacraments on account of an admitted moral offence those who understand and accept religion, rests upon a divine sanction or is of man's devising.* He argues that there is

no divine authority for such excommunication in Scripture, either in the Jewish Church or in the teaching of Christ or in the Apostolic Church. Where Christians live under a non-Christian government, there may be a court for rebuking 'spurcos et foedos homines,' but even this court will not be able to repel such individuals from the sacraments if they wish to resort thither (No. 75). Where the government is Christian, then the magistrate can be trusted to deal with all offences that cause scandal. Erastus gives to such a '*pius magistratus*' the right of 'constituting religion' such as belonged to Moses, David, Solomon, or Hezekiah; but he restricts this right to the '*pius magistratus*.'

This continual reference to the policy of the Old Testament seems strange to us, but Erastus lived when Lutheran, Zwinglian, Calvinist, and even Socinian appealed to the Scriptures as understood in a pre-critical age.

Theses 37 and 38 are an important statement of the Zwinglian view of the Sacrament, but the main purpose of the book is the question whether there is any divine authority for repelling those who are both orthodox and penitent, and he answers in the negative. Apparently he regarded the desire to communicate as proof of the penitence.

In 1567 this question may have been *gravissima*, but that epithet could not be applied to it in England to-day. Thus in 1876 a Bristol incumbent tried to repel from communion a layman on the ground that his views were unsound as to the authority of scripture and the personality of the devil, but as the attempted excommunication was on theological, not moral grounds, it is not relevant to the question treated by Erastus. In 1908, in the case of Banister *v.* Thompson, the attempted excommunication of one who had contracted marriage under the Deceased Wife's Sister Act was frustrated by a judicial decision. Possibly the question might again arise in connection with a divorced person desiring to communicate. But excommunication does not worry the average Churchman in this country, and where an English Churchman is said to be Erastian the phrase means more than agreement with Erastus's views on excommunication; as Erastus does not touch on any other subject, Erastus was therefore not an Erastian.

To-day an Erastian is one who claims that a Christian State may exercise some control over that portion of the Christian Church which is located within its territories. The term Erastianism therefore raises the question as to the relation of the State towards any other corporation claiming authority, whether that corporation be a college, a society of lawyers, a trade union, or a church. In its relation to a Church there are three attitudes for the State.

I. Repression. II. Toleration. III. Alliance.

I. Until 313 the State (*i.e.* the Roman Empire) repressed the Christian Church as a corporation dangerous to its interests. In 313 the Roman Empire abandoned that policy which was not tried again in Europe by any civilized state until the French Revolution. Where a government has persecuted some particular Church its action has not been a persecution of Christianity, but of some body regarded by the State (and by the official Church) as a perversion of Christianity.

II. From 313 until the end of the eighteenth century the usual policy in all states claiming to be Christian was Alliance. But Alliance often led to situations humiliating to the ecclesiastical partner; thus (1) between 313 and the fall of the Western Roman Empire theological questions were sometimes settled by the whims of the emperor or his wife. (2) With the fall of the Western Empire there was for centuries no secular power sufficiently civilized to deal with theology, and the Popes held their own against barbarous, if nominally Christian, kings. In the East emperors at Constantinople continued to dictate to the Church until this Caesaro-papism ended with the Turkish conquests; it continued, however, in Russia with disastrous results for the Russian Church in our own day.

(3) We pass to the Reformation.

(A) In that section of the Church termed Roman-Catholic subservience to the State has never been accepted as a principle; yet the Roman Catholic Church since the Counter-Reformation has not been free from State intervention, as when Church affairs in France were regulated by the concordat made by Napoleon with the Pope (1801 — 1905) or when the Austrian emperor had the right to veto a papal election.

(B) In countries that accepted the Reformation there are several varieties of relation between Church and State.

(*a*) In the Lutheran Churches the prince was *summus episcopus*, and these Churches have usually accepted a considerable measure of State control.

(*b*) The Zwinglian Churches seem to have made an easy alliance with the State, but the Swiss cantons were of the nature of republican city states where accommodation between minister and magistrate was perhaps not difficult.

(*c*) The Calvinist Churches held a view of Church independence that recalls Hildebrand, and, where possible, the Church has controlled the State. The extent of Calvin's domination at Geneva has perhaps been exaggerated, but in Scotland an attempt was made, through Andrew Melville rather than through John Knox, to make the Church independent of the Crown and to execute discipline through Kirk Sessions and Presbyteries composed of ministers and lay elders. The Reformation period in Scotland ended in 1690 with the establishment of Presbyterianism in the National Church and the secession of Episcopalian dissenters; but from then until 1843 it was felt that the State interfered with the spiritual freedom of the Church, and this discontent led to more than one schism in the eighteenth century and to the Disruption of 1843, when about a third of the ministers seceded and formed the Free Church of Scotland; in 1929 the majority of these dissenting Presbyterian Churches felt that the grievances that had justified the disruption had been removed and therefore reunited with the Church of Scotland; a minority, however, remains outside, and has committed itself to the 'voluntary principle' (*i.e.* no alliance between Church and State) which was *not* taken by the leaders of the Free Church in 1843.

(*d*) In England the Reformation was the work of the laity and especially of successive sovereigns; and since then the sovereign has been 'supreme governor' of the Church of England, exercising as such supremacy over appointments, legislation and appeals.

In 1643 an attempt was made to substitute in England the Presbyterian discipline imposed on Scotland. In the Assembly convened for that purpose were some laymen who disliked the

tyranny of Presbyterian Calvinism as much as that of Archbishop Laud; typical of these laymen was the amiable and cynical John Selden, who said:

> 'There must always be laymen in the synod to overlook the clergy, lest they spoil the civil work: just as when the good woman puts a cat into the milkhouse to kill a mouse she sends a maid to look after the cat lest it should eat up the cream.'

Selden and his group were significantly termed 'Erastians.'

The attempt to impose the Presbyterian discipline failed, and in 1660 the Bishops returned; in 1689 a new policy began when orthodox Protestant dissent was tolerated. By that time most Englishmen realized the mischief done by religious fanatics and desired a Christianity which should be decent, reasonable, tolerant, and free from fanaticism, and such a religion could best be maintained by a Church system mutually agreed upon by the authorities of Church and State, where an ordered freedom is secured for all under the protection of the law and the sovereign, who is supreme over all persons and causes, whether ecclesiastical or civil. The Anglican conscience was not outraged when the factious temper of Convocation (which had been allowed to meet since 1700 after having been in abeyance from 1664—1689) led to its suppression in 1717, nor was there much excitement when it again met to transact business in 1852. Important changes were made in the management of Church business by the Enabling Act of 1919, but this act did not interfere with the Royal Supremacy over appointments, legislation and appeals which is the main element of Establishment as understood in England.

III. Thus from the fourth to the end of the eighteenth century the usual policy of the State towards the Church has been Alliance. Since the French Revolution the demand for complete freedom of thought combined with the dislike of 'privilege' has led many Christians as well as non-Christians to substitute a policy of Toleration whereby the State recognizes any Church that is not a social and political nuisance merely as a property-holding body. Hence in several European countries (including Ireland and Wales) Churches have been disestablished: and in new countries such as our Dominions overseas there has never been (with few exceptions) anything like an established Church.

The attempted solutions of the problem in Great Britain are worthy of special consideration.

In Scotland the Church of Scotland, which now numbers one-fourth of the whole population among its communicant members, has complete freedom to manage its own affairs so long as it adheres to the principles of the Scottish Reformation; that Church, however, is homogeneous to a greater extent than is the Church of England, and through its Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assembly it has a long tradition of efficient self-government. It is Established in that it is recognized by the State as the official version of Reformed Christianity in Scotland.

In England, though every form of dissent is permitted, the Church of England is recognized as the English version of Reformed Christianity: in England Establishment means the Royal Supremacy over Appointments, Legislation and Appeals. In the evolution of our constitution the Royal Supremacy over the higher Church appointments is now vested in the Prime Minister; over Church legislation in Parliament; over Church appeals in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (since 1833). Though this arrangement is open to theoretical objections, in practice it has been found to work out satisfactorily, nor does the average English Churchman desire any change. It should be noted that the Judicial Committee has vindicated in turn the Evangelical, the Broad Church, and the High Church schools of thought.

At present, owing to recent events in Germany, there is even in Great Britain some uneasiness about Established Churches, but probably the majority of members both of the English and of the Scottish Established Churches would vote for a continuance of the present arrangements so long as responsible public opinion remains Christian.

The substitution of Toleration for Alliance would not necessarily improve the position of Churches now established. Thus if the Church of England were disestablished, it would not necessarily have freedom to do exactly what its ecclesiastics might wish. If a bishop excommunicated a member as an 'evil-liver,' the member could still sue the bishop for libel in the civil courts, and if he won his case the discipline of the 'free' Church

would be no more respectable than it is under present conditions. Again, a free Church, so long as it holds property, must have a trust-deed, and if the authorities of the Church violated that deed justice could still be secured in the civil courts. Hence those who demand disestablishment in the name of spiritual freedom should consider the possible results of such action.

This is admittedly written from an Erastian point of view, but such Erastianism goes far beyond anything contemplated by Erastus.

In regard to the question raised by Erastus, that of Excommunication, those of us who are Erastians agree that neither an individual minister nor a church council should be able to repel anyone from the sacrament; that the question of communion should be left to the conscience of the individual, subject only to the present rubric about 'notorious evil-livers, etc.,' in which case there is an appeal from the 'ordinary' (*i.e.* the bishop) to the civil courts if the bishop should be guilty of libel.

In regard to the further question of Church and State which Erastus does not raise, we believe that where public opinion is Christian the partnership is good for both State and Church; that if (as in Scotland) an established Church is capable of governing itself, it is safe to grant to it the freedom which that Church now enjoys; if the conditions are different, as in England, it seems best that the Christian State should until those conditions change retain control of Church appointments, legislation and appeals. Hence we support the two Established Churches in Great Britain, Episcopalian in England and Presbyterian in Scotland, each on its present basis. This support is conditional on responsible public opinion remaining Christian; if in either country public opinion and State policy became anti-Christian, we should have to demand the dissolution of that partnership. Those who think that that deplorable situation has already come to pass are consistent in demanding disestablishment; those of us who think that responsible public opinion in both countries is still in sympathy with Christian ideals remain Erastian: that is, we see no reason to change the constitution of either of the two Established and Reformed Churches that together express more adequately than their competitors the religious genius of Great Britain.

THE ASCENSION:
A RE-INTERPRETATION*

'Seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.'—*Col.* iii, 1.

I.

ASCENSION DAY commemorates the belief, stated in our creeds, that Jesus Christ 'ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.' It is our contention that the value of this belief can only be understood to-day if the first clause 'He ascended' is interpreted, like the second, 'sitteth at the right hand of the Father,' in a symbolical sense. If the creeds, for instance, stated 'He is ascended' rather than 'He ascended' considerable difficulties would be removed.

Even Dr. Pearson, the seventeenth century divine, whose famous *Exposition of the Creed*, though it makes quaint reading to-day, was a standard work in the library of every Anglican parson for over two hundred years, declares that the expressions 'sitteth' and 'on the right hand of God' are 'both to be taken metaphorically'; yet of the Ascension he writes:

> 'I am fully persuaded that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God did . . . by a true and local translation convey Himself from the earth in which He lived, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestial orbs, until He came into the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the majesty of God.'[1]

This literal view of the Ascension as being a levitation into a local heaven of our Lord's risen body 'with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature' is, according to our Fourth Article of Religion, still apparently the official and orthodox view of the Church of England, and is supported also by nearly everything we say and sing about it in our church services.

II.

Before I was ordained I felt, like most Englishmen then, and at the present day, but little interest in the Festival of the Ascension. At school an extra half-holiday reminded us that it

* A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Ascension Day, 1935, by the Rev. A. E. N. Hitchcock, M.A., Rector of St. Botolph's, Cambridge.

[1] Chevalier's edition, p. 514.

was a Church Festival, and custom or piety probably made me a communicant in the morning. Otherwise the Ascension implied little more than a name in the Church Kalendar, and I don't suppose I troubled to think very seriously what it meant or how much or how little I believed about it.

It was only after I was ordained and found myself confronted with the task of preaching sermons at Ascensiontide that I began to think about it and to realize how very difficult it was to try and explain the Ascension to ordinary congregations in any but vague and conventional phrases. 'What could one say about it?' I asked myself.

(*a*) To speak of heaven as a state rather than a fixed place was a natural opening; but if that were so, was not Christ in heaven before the final parting from His disciples on the Mount of Olives? And what lessons did the Ascension teach which did not apply equally to Easter Day?

(*b*) Unable to answer that difficulty, I started on another line of thought suggested by the words of the Ascension Day hymn:

> 'Still for us He intercedes,
> His prevailing death He pleads.'

Was it not one of the main lessons of Ascension Day that from that time onward Christ began to intercede for us, pleading His sacrifice on the Cross as a satisfaction for all our sin? But here further perplexities arose; and having preserved a copy of a letter written to a Church paper not long after my ordination, I can state those perplexities in the words I wrote then:

> 'I cannot believe that Jesus, by virtue of what He has done, offers a sort of bribe to an otherwise unwilling God, that He may change His mind and forgive us, instead of inflicting the punishment which would otherwise befall us. This theory seems to reduce God to the level of a half-savage and angry monarch who is about to wreak vengeance on a rebellious city, but after negotiations agrees to spare the city if some of its bravest citizens and fairest daughters are hanged before his eyes. Anything further from the Christian revelation of God as our loving Father can hardly be imagined, and yet this heathenish theory of the Atonement seems to be implied in a great deal of the language of our Prayer Book and particularly in the orthodox teaching about Ascension Day.'[2]

Such were the views, rather crudely expressed perhaps, of a young curate shortly before the War. The letter produced an interesting correspondence, at the conclusion of which I wrote

[2] *Modern Churchman*, Vol. III, p. 103.

again to the *Modern Churchman* saying that, though many of the clergy did not appear to lack learning, yet in many cases they did seem to lack the mental and moral courage which is needed to tell their congregations each Sunday what must be their real and honest belief in those matters with which it is their privilege and duty to deal. Too often they used the old terms without explaining their real meaning. Perhaps they feared lest somebody's faith might be disturbed by new teaching; whereas I felt certain that if one person's faith were troubled by hearing the truth, there would be fifty more who were made hostile, or at least indifferent, to a Church whose clergy had not the courage to say what they thought, but preferred to shield their orthodoxy behind conventional and traditional phrases. This letter concluded:

> 'We have no fear that England will cease to believe in God, but we may well fear lest England should cease to respect her Church, and to hearken to her clergy.' [3]

An interesting illustration of the effect of such hesitancy on the part of Church authorities to say clearly what they think was afforded a few years ago when a stir was created in the popular press by the sermons of an outspoken bishop who repudiated the traditional version of the creation and the fall of man. It was, I think, Archbishop Davidson who characteristically poured oil on the troubled waters by saying that Bishop Barnes' views on this subject had been common knowledge to himself and his fellow bishops, and had been taught in all our theological colleges, for at least a generation past. Quite so; but that being the case one feels inclined respectfully to ask why, in the name of truth, did not the Archbishops and Bishops, with the weight of their authority behind them, emphatically say so before, not merely in learned volumes written for students of theology, but in public pronouncements which would reach the man in the street? Perhaps it is not always realized that the theological knowledge of the average parish priest is generally twenty years behind that of the University schools, and that of many worshippers in the average parish church anything from twenty to forty years further behind still. It is to be hoped that in this diocese the Five Years Plan of teaching about to be launched

[3] *Modern Churchman*, Vol. III, p. 270.

by the Bishop of Ely will do something to narrow both these gaps. But truth must be proclaimed over and over again from the housetops, and though the first people to proclaim it loud enough to wake their neighbours are deemed a nuisance, it is through their persistence that it ultimately prevails.

III.

But to come back to Ascension Day. It is more than twenty years since the letters I have quoted were written, and again their writer asks, 'What can one teach about the Ascension to-day?' Our Creeds, our Articles of Religion, the Epistle and Gospel for the day, and most of our hymns and prayers are the same as they were before. The only difference is that in the Revised Prayer Book of 1928 an alternative Gospel from the concluding verses of *St. Luke* may be read instead of the corresponding passage from *St. Mark*. This optional change recognizes the fact, which has been known to everyone who has read the margin of the Revised Version for the past fifty years, that the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel are not the original ending, but were added by a later hand.

So far, so good. But what have the Prayer Book revisers given us in their place? They have included in *Luke* xxiv, 51 the words 'and was carried up into heaven,' which are omitted in the codex Bezae and some important cursive MSS., added by a later hand in codex Sinaiticus, and doubly bracketed by Westcott and Hort in their Greek New Testament. So in order to give Gospel authority for the Ascension in the literal sense of a bodily levitation into the sky they have substituted for the pseudo-*Mark* a passage from *Luke* in which the phrase mentioning the Ascension is regarded by most authorities as an interpolation. In other words, they have tried to remove the possible effect of one misleading passage by allowing as an alternative another passage which to uninformed worshippers is at least equally misleading!

Is it surprising that we ordinary parish clergy and the laity of our congregations are sometimes 'behind the times' when the learned bishops and scholars who expended years of patient labour in the attempted revision of our Prayer Book have overlooked one of the assured results of textual criticism?

The fact is — and our Church has missed an opportunity of officially recognizing it — that the only passage in the New Testament which speaks of our Lord's body being carried up through the clouds is the first chapter of *Acts*. The Fourth Gospel indeed uses the word ἀναβαίνειν (to go up) on two occasions (*Jn.* v, 62, and xx, 17), but it is followed in the one instance by the words 'where he was before' and in the other by 'to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.' These are spiritual rather than local expressions, and in view of this evangelist's spiritual interpretation of the expectation of our Lord's return it is scarcely probable that he regarded His 'going up to the Father' in a different manner.

We must therefore contrast the mode of our Lord's last disappearance from His disciples as described in the Gospels with that in the *Acts*, and, as the preacher from this pulpit last year pointed out, it is not difficult to see how the development of thought about our Lord's risen body amongst the second generation of Christians, together with the expectation of His visible return, would account for the later theory of its local translation as a necessary corollary. There is good reason, therefore, for regarding the Ascension, like the heavenly session, as spiritual and metaphorical only, and once that fact has been generally recognized we shall have cleared away its greatest difficulty from people's minds and be able to see more clearly the essential lessons that it teaches.

To understand the value of Ascensiontide to-day we must look at it from the point of view of experience, rather than as a single historical event in the past. There are two ways in which we can think of Jesus Christ.

(i) We can picture Him as He lived on earth nineteen hundred years ago, going about doing good, healing the sick, exposing hypocrisy, and teaching in His inimitable way the vital truths about God and our fellow-men which form the basis of the Christian ethic. That is the 'Jesus of History,' the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, and belief in Him as their example in daily life is as far as the faith of many people will carry them to-day.

(ii) But the New Testament is made up of other writings besides the Synoptic Gospels, and these other writings show us a

different aspect of Christianity which, though it presupposes and includes the first, takes us further. In the Epistles, some of which were written earlier than any of our Gospels, our Lord is thought of scarcely at all as He was during the thirty years when He lived on earth, but as He is, ascended at God's right hand, worshipped by His struggling Church and giving to all believers the power over evil that He had won. By virtue of His victory over sin and death God had

> 'highly exalted Him and given Him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father' (*Phil.* ii, 9-11).

This is no mere Jesus of history, but one who reigns supreme in the spiritual world to which He has taken His personal experience of our world and of human life.

That such a view of our Lord's exaltation does not depend only upon St. Paul's epistles is clear to every reader of the New Testament. That strange book, the *Revelation of St. John*, is based on the idea of Christ, the Lamb who had been slain, now exalted and worshipped at God's right hand, and sympathizing with the sufferings of His Church. Or again, the Fourth Gospel is steeped in the mystical idea of the Word, who became flesh and dwelt amongst us, making ready His disciples for the day when they should see His face no more, because He would return to the Father to prepare a place for them in His abode of many mansions.

From these separate and independent sources we see that this was the Good News which was spread about the bounds of the Mediterranean Sea and enabled the Church to grow and stand firm against trials from within and from without: that Jesus not only lived and died and was raised from the dead, but that He is for all time ascended and exalted at God's right hand, as we say, 'on high.' If we take this view of the Ascension we need not exercise our minds about 'where' or 'what is heaven?'; or what exactly happened on that spring morning when Jesus was seen by His disciples for the last time. But Ascensiontide will help us to realize that the 'Jesus of History' is succeeded by 'Jesus in the Experience of Men,' whom we worship as 'King of kings and Lord of lords'; and because any

presentation of our creed which omits this aspect of the Christian Faith will be inadequate, Ascension Day must be a festival of primary importance to the Church.

IV.

But there is one more question about the teaching of Ascensiontide that we mentioned earlier. What truth is there in the poetical statement we quoted then,

> 'Still for us He intercedes,
> His prevailing death He pleads,'

a statement evidently based on the passage in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* which speaks of Jesus as

> 'our high-priest, holy, guileless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, who ever liveth to make intercession for us' (*Heb.* vii, 25, 26)?

That question I tried to answer for myself at the time at the end of the letter I have quoted:

> 'Christ does not intercede with God to change His mind [and forgive where He would not have forgiven before], but He intercedes with *us*, wilful and selfish children that we are, to love and obey our Father. He intercedes in virtue of His life spent in fulfilling God's will. For not only on Calvary, but throughout all His earthly ministry, His every thought and act was sacrificed on the altar of God's eternal purpose, and that life He, who has triumphed, asks us now to share.'

That view I still feel, after these twenty years, to be the only way in which I can understand what is meant by Christ's high-priestly intercession; and if it is not in accord with the views of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, it does seem more consistent with the saying attributed to our Lord in the Gospel for last Sunday,

> 'In that day ye shall ask in my name; and I say not unto you that I will pray the Father for you; for the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved me and have believed that I came out from God' (*Jn.* xvi, 26, 27).

The Supreme Sacrifice is ever the centre of Christian thought and aspiration: to it, as in the Holy Communion, the members of Christ's body must humbly bring their lesser and imperfect sacrifices, and in union with their Head offer themselves gratefully in God's service.

At the same time we like to feel that Christ is praying for those who do not love and believe in Him, just as we might pray for an erring child or brother. But any idea of Christ's death

being pleaded before the Father as a propitiation for our sins and the sins of others is one which every lover of the truth should wish to see expunged from all forms of Christian worship, and not keep silence until his wish has been fulfilled. Every theologian, indeed, knows that ἱλαστήριον, the Greek word translated 'propitiation' in *Rom.* iii, 25, is used in *Heb.* ix, 5 of the cover of the ark, and is there rendered 'mercy seat' in the Authorized Version; so that it may be possible to give some such significance to ἱλασμός also in *I John* i, 2.

But words are intended to convey meanings, not to conceal them, and to the ordinary worshipper 'propitiation,' repeated regularly in the Comfortable Words, suggests the appeasement of someone's wrath. It can serve no useful purpose whatever to continue using terms which may mean something different from what they appear to mean.

Our chief complaint with many of the terms of our creeds and other Church formularies is that we can only use them today by employing ingenious mental subterfuges to explain away their obvious meaning. Unless words like 'propitiation' and 'satisfaction' are so ingeniously interpreted as to give them a meaning quite different from what they appear to mean, and indeed have meant in the history of Christian doctrine, they are misleading, heathenish and abhorrent.

From such perversions of Christianity we turn with relief to the collect for this day, the one Prayer Book passage which suggests a spiritual view of the Ascension. When we pray that 'as we believe our Lord Jesus Christ to have ascended into the heavens, so may we also in heart and mind thither ascend,' we recall that the road to His Ascension was the way of the Cross, and that we too must tread that way if we hope for our prayer to be fulfilled. But we do not tread the steep ascent alone. He who is ascended calls to us from above: 'Lift up your hearts.' And so 'we lift them up unto the Lord.'

THE TRAVELS OF PIETRO DELLA VALLE IN INDIA, 300 YEARS AGO

By J. M. Macfie, D.D.

IT was a disappointment in love that made della Valle a traveller. A native of Rome, he was persuaded by a friend to find solace and distraction in foreign lands. And thanks to the letters, which he addressed to this friend Dr. Schipano for twelve long years, we can follow his career to-day. He sailed for the East in 1614. He did not return till 1626. After a year in Constantinople, he travelled through Asia Minor to Palestine, Egypt and Mesopotamia. Two years after leaving home, he once more fell in love. The lady was an Assyrian Christian whom he married in Baghdad. After a stay of some years in Persia, where he became intimate with its ruler Shah Abbas, he came down to the Persian Gulf, his intention being to visit India. Near Ormuz his wife died in the month of December 1622. The heart-broken husband caused the body to be embalmed and placed in a coffin, which he took with him to India and eventually, after encountering many difficulties, brought back to Rome. There it found a final resting place in the tomb of his own people nearly four years later. It must have been a weird experience. But della Valle made it easier for himself by carrying with him a Georgian girl Maria Tinctin to take charge of what his seventeenth century English translator calls the *reliques*. Maria had been adopted by his wife as a companion some years before, and it is very much to della Valle's credit, that wherever he went, whether among the Dutch or the Portuguese, he made it his first business to find accommodation for her with their women folk or in a convent.

A month after his wife's death, della Valle secured a passage for Surat in an English vessel, the *Whale*, Captain Woodcock. He was much impressed with the skill and carefulness of the captain, a striking contrast to the Portuguese, who often lost their ships through ignorance, negligence or malice. The *Whale*

and its sister ship, the *Dolphin*, arrived at Surat after a month's voyage. In addition to the Dutch, the English had established a factory there a few years before, and the vessels at once received a visit from the head of the factory, accompanied by three other Englishmen, 'one of them being a minister, so they call those who exercise the office of priest.' There was some delay in getting ashore, partly because a Sunday intervened, and that was a sacred day. And when they did get into port, della Valle offended the English by declining their hospitality and accepting that of the Dutch. But he had a good reason. The English had no womenfolk, whereas the Dutch had, and in the house of one of them he found suitable shelter for his ward. It is here that della Valle casts an interesting side-light on the practices of those days. It was the habit of the Portuguese government to send out orphan girls from Lisbon to be married in the East. A year before, in a naval engagement, the Dutch had captured a vessel from Lisbon. Among the booty were three such maidens, and one of them had been married to the richest Dutchman in Surat and so generously treated that she was allowed to practice her own religion in secret.

Della Valle, being himself a noble Roman, was much impressed with the luxury which these shop-keepers enjoyed. When they went abroad, they were accompanied by a great train of men on horseback and on foot armed with swords and bucklers, bows and arrows. But he adds quite charitably that it did not cost them much, because in wages, food and clothing for each servant they did not pay more than three rupees a month.

In company with a friend whom he had met in Persia and who was waiting for him in Surat, della Valle travelled as far north as Ahmedabad. Both there and in Broach he met the English agents of the East India Company. He went and came in a caravan, which made the journey once a week, the insecurity of the ways not allowing them to travel alone. On his return to Surat he made his plans to go to Goa, a sea voyage of some 150 miles. The vessel called at Daman, and there he found four Roman Catholic orders established, Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans and Augustines, each of them with a Church, and at Bassein, with a Jesuit college and several priests, while at a distance they passed what della Valle calls the city of Salsette,

but which it has been suggested was more probably Bombay. During part of the voyage, there were no less than two hundred vessels travelling in company, sometimes dangerously huddled together for fear of the Malabar pirates.

Della Valle was not impressed with Goa, the capital of Portuguese India. It was a priest-ridden town, with far too many religious orders, too many churches and convents, and far too many religious processions. In some of these last, which were masquerades, della Valle took part, but he noted with disapproval that the different orders only attended their own processions, for which unbrotherly procedure he blamed the Jesuits. But there were always plenty of spectators ready to run and crowd the streets at any moment. As parts of divine worship he recognized that such spectacles served a good purpose, but Goa had more of them than any other city in the world, and he was convinced that it was dangerous. Living as they did surrounded by barbarians they allowed their minds to be distracted. Besides it was a burden to the administration and a weakening of their defence to maintain so many religious persons. But della Valle had a very poor opinion of the Portuguese. They were a vain people 'naturally idle and addicted to shows.' They were lacking in order and discipline. They passed laws and did not keep them. They made alliances with native princes and then betrayed them. Time after time such princes had been deluded till nobody trusted the Portuguese any more. The Shah of Persia with the assistance of the English had driven them out of Ormuz. They had been defeated not long before by the Rajah of Ikkeri, and now instead of adopting a bold, courageous policy they were willing to be obsequious, even to grovel, just as at other times they were rude and overbearing in their treatment of the natives. They had not even table manners. They had fallen into the Indian habit of eating with their fingers, whereas he, della Valle, true to his nice Italian ways, always insisted on using a napkin and a silver spoon! It is a damning verdict, prophetic of the palsy which ere long was to become evident to all Europe, and nowhere more evident than in the way in which they would listen greedily to every rumour that came to them by every ship from Europe, and pass on for truth to the rajahs of Southern India, 'A great fleet was coming from Portugal with a great army.

There was an alliance between Spain and England; the Prince of England was on his way to Spain; he was to marry the King's daughter; all England had been reduced to the Catholic faith by the public command of their monarch: Good God! with other such levities usual to the Portuguese, who are very ignorant of the affairs of the world.'

No wonder della Valle was glad to escape from Goa. He went as far south as Calicut. He also journeyed inland for some distance: the scenery was charming. He climbed the Ghats, which reminded him of his native Appennines, while the Garsopa with its many windings was the goodliest river that he ever beheld. Hills and valleys all green and delightful to the eye, the banks beset with flowers. It was the happiest three month's travel in all his experience.

The servant whom he brought from Persia had attempted to rob him, and with characteristic generosity della Valle had sent him back to Goa without exacting punishment, but when thus entirely alone he seemed all the happier. His knowledge of Arabic and Persian were now of little use, but with the aid of a Brahmin interpreter acquainted with Portuguese who was with him part of the way, and a porter with the size of whose burden he genuinely sympathised, he managed to secure both food and lodging in various cottages.

During the earlier part of this expedition della Valle accompanied a Goanese ambassador to the court of a native prince. It was when he was alone that he had his most interesting experience — his interview with the Queen of Olala, a most energetic person. This woman, a queen in her own right, had years before married the ruler of a neighbouring state, though she continued to administer her own dominion. Getting tired of her husband, however, she not only divorced him, but defeated him in battle. Della Valle was anxious to meet this warlike queen, but when they met he received a shock. Like other women of these parts, the queen was barefooted and naked from the waist upwards. Her one concession to the modesty which he had associated with the East was a cloth tied round her head and hanging a little down upon her shoulders; more like a dirty kitchen wench, says our traveller, than a delicate and noble queen. But when she spoke, she showed her quality, and by means of the interpreter

already referred to she put him through a series of questions as to the purpose of his journey, what countries he had seen and why he had ventured so far from home with no one to care for him. The first question gave him the opportunity to tell how the fame of her greatness had brought him to seek an audience; the last to speak of his dead wife and his unavailing sorrow. That day, however, the queen was busy and another day was appointed, but he never saw the queen again. For some reason unknown, she purposely evaded him, and della Valle had to be content with the heir apparent, an intelligent young man who insisted on watching him at a meal and was greatly astonished at his snowy napkin and silver spoon.

When he was at Calicut della Valle had a further illustration of the freedom which Indian women in those parts enjoyed. Invited to visit the rajah, his two nieces, girls about twelve years of age, were present throughout the interview, which lasted till late at night, while the rajah's sister and other women of quality watched them from an open balcony, clothed in the usual scanty manner, but abundantly adorned with jewels. 'One of the little princesses approaching gently towards me almost touched the sleeve of my coat with her hand, making a sign of wonder to her sister how we could go so wrapped up and entangled in clothes. Such is the power of custom that their going naked seemed no more strange to us than our being clothed appeared extravagant to them.'

Only once in all his travels does della Valle show himself lacking in courtesy, and that was in his treatment of an idol, which he was told was an image of the Devil. His interpreter begged him not to enter the temple in which the idol stood because some calamity would certainly befall him. But I told him, says della Valle, 'That I was not afraid of the devil. He had no power over me, wherefore I went forward alone. Invoking the Name of Jesus, at which Heaven, Earth and Hell ought to bow the Knee, I mounted the hill, opened the door and went in.' He was surprised to find that the idol was not at all what he expected to see, because 'It was of white marble and showed a handsome young man with four arms and a great crown upon his head. Between his legs was another statue of a naked man with a long beard, and upon this idol the devil seemed to ride. When

I had seen all and spit several times in the idol's face, I came away, upbraiding the interpreter for his cowardice and telling him that he might see whether my religion were good or no.'

Apart from this lapse, it is interesting to observe how frequently the traveller visited a variety of temples and took careful note not only of the chief god to whom the temple was devoted, but of the other deities represented there.

In view of the fact that Monier Williams has given currency to the belief that in India to-day there are only two temples devoted to Brahma the Creator, one at Pushkar, near Ajmer, and another in the state of Idar, special interest attaches to an account of the temple of Brahma, at the village of Nagra, two miles from Cambay. This temple is still in existence and Brahma is still the object of daily worship, surrounded by the same figures or their equivalents as stood there, three hundred years ago. Like Edward Terry, della Valle indentifies Brahma with Pythagoras. But here is his description : 'There are (within this temple) many idols of white marble. The biggest is the Chief and hath the worthiest place : in the middle is the statue Brahma or Pythagoras, with many arms and faces as they ordinarily portray him, namely, three faces, for I could not see whether there were a fourth or more behind : 'tis naked with a long picked beard. This figure of Brahma stands upright and at his feet two other figures, his two sons, Sunnet and Sunnatan. On each side of Brahma stand likewise two statues of women somewhat less than Brahma himself, and they call them his wives Savetri and Gavetri.' To the left were two other naked male statues, who the traveller was told were disciples, but, more correctly, were Brahma's two other mind-born sons. There were 'many other idolets,' but della Valle only specifies the 'one with an elephant's head,' that is Ganesh, the son of Shiva. 'All which idols are served, adored, perfumed and washed every day by the Brachmans.'

On two other occasions, when describing temples dedicated to Shiva, in the list of other idols present, he gives Brahma as well as Ganesh and the Man Lion, an avatar of Vishnu; while within the palace at Calicut he noticed a small temple in which the central image was Brahma on his peacock, the bird he is supposed to ride.

As to the religious practices of the Hindus he comments on the triple thread which the twice-born wear; the way in which *holy men* smear their bodies with the ashes of the dead; their belief in transmigration from body to body, not only of men but of animals, and thus purging away their sins; their fondness for pilgrimages; their hospitals for animals and birds; their division into castes; their refusal to eat and drink with people of other castes, in many cases even to touch them, or receive anything directly from their hands; the marvellous efficacy of cow-dung; and their confidence that their gods can work miracles and heal the sick. With these and other aspects of Hindu life—he has little to say about the Moslems—he deals in kindly and intelligent fashion, acknowledging that the Indians agree with the voice of morality and the universal consent of mankind that there are differences of Virtue and Vice in all the world. What struck him most was the practice of *Suttee* or widow-burning. It both impressed and revolted him. He heard of how seventeen widows had been burned with the dead body of a rajah, and of how, when a woman terrified by the flames sought to escape, she would be driven back into the fire by those standing by. On the other hand, we have a very graphic account of della Valle's conversation with a widow who was to be burned alone nineteen days after her husband's death. It was in the native state of Ikweri, because the Portuguese had forbidden Suttee in the territory they occupied very soon after their arrival in India, an example which the British Government had not the courage to follow till 1829. This widow whom della Valle saw and spoke to rode round the town on horseback followed by a great company of men and women, on several successive days. There were three widows, both older than she, but they had refused to join her, pleading a duty to their children. She also had children, and della Valle begged her to have pity on them. 'But all my speaking was in vain, and she answered me to all my reasons with a countenance not only undismayed and constant, but even cheerful, and spoke in such a manner as showed that she had not the least fear of death. She said that she accounted my coming to see her a great fortune and held herself much honoured as well by my visit and presence as by the fame which I should carry of her to my own country. I promised her that as

far as my weak pen could contribute, her name should remain immortal in the world. Thus I took leave of her, more sad for her death than she was, cursing the custom of India, which is so unmerciful to women.'

Europe was indeed fortunate in having two men so wise and just in their judgments, who visited India within a few years of each other, and wrote such interesting accounts of what they had seen, as Edward Terry, chaplain to Sir Thomas Roe, and Pietro della Valle. And English readers have special cause to be grateful to Havers, the otherwise unknown translator of della Valle's *Travels*, when in 1665 he published with his own great achievement a skilful abridgement of Terry's *Voyage to East India*, which had first appeared ten years before.

RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN AUSTRIA

By the Rev. G. H. D. Grimes, M.A., F.R.G.S., Chaplain to the British Legation, Vienna.

IN Austria, with its population of some six and a half millions, there are only some 300,000 Protestants. It will thus be seen that Protestantism is not an important feature of the national life. It is divided up into two Churches, Lutheran and Calvinistic. The former looks to Germany as its spiritual home, and until recently drew largely on Germany for financial support. The closing of the barriers between the two countries under the present régime has cut off both spiritual and financial help, and has thus had an adverse effect on this branch of the Church in Austria. The Calvinistic Church, on the other hand, looks to Switzerland for this support, and hard times have undoubtedly reduced such assistance from that quarter. The Lutheran Church is much the stronger of the two, since it numbers 280,000 adherents, as against 20,000 Calvinists.

Curiously enough, the two chief churches of each confession stand almost side by side in the same street in Vienna — the Dorotheagasse. The Lutheran at the beginning of the year celebrated its 150th anniversary with an imposing service, which bore witness to the good work it is doing. Fortunately, quite

recently the two Churches, while retaining their separate modes of worship, have consented to work together under a common head, Superintendent Heinzelman, who is said to be a man of earnestness of purpose, as well as of sound judgment. The question of giving him the title of bishop — a title common in the Lutheran Church, but unknown in the Calvinistic—has been much debated, but so far no decision has been made. Pastor Heinzelman issues each month to the pastors under him a letter which frankly and boldly faces the issues before them, and thus he shows himself a leader not afraid to lead.

There has been considerable talk, to which I have seen several references in the English press, concerning the number of converts made recently to Protestantism, and it has been assumed that the cause is making considerable headway. It is just one of those cases where figures may easily be very misleading. The Protestants claim to have made 21,000 new adherents last year, and I do not think that the figure is disputed. Make this statement by itself, as one English Church newspaper did, without the corresponding statement that in the same time the Romans had added 50,000 converts, and it is easily seen that a very one-sided impression is gained — an impression which in some Protestant quarters in England they did not thank me for trying to remove. So much for religious fairness.

To what, however, is due this amazing mass of new converts —to renewed zeal on the part of the Church? The Protestants themselves here frankly admit that it is not so, but is the result of an edict of the Government whereby everyone who wishes to be eligible for any public office, however unimportant, must belong to some religious denomination. Now before the present Government came into office, in Vienna at any rate, it was the other way about; to be anti-religious was to stand well with the Government. Consequently a large number of people, for these and other reasons, were without a religion. But now, with equal facility, they flock back to one — real Vicars of Bray. Many, however, who were once Catholics, although it would obviously pay them best to become Catholics, since the Government is overwhelmingly Catholic, so hate the Catholic Church, or so hate the Government, which is Catholic, especially for their severity towards the workers last February, that rather than become

Catholics they became Protestants. Others have joined the Old Catholics, who claim some 6,000 new adherents, which for their small numbers makes an important addition; and there are some who would have liked to join the Anglican Church, but we cannot accept them on that ground.

When we ask, however, whether it has been a great gain to these Churches to have these mass converts, the answer is, I think, decidedly No. They have brought with them their political atmosphere, and so have infected the Churches with that atmosphere. Thus history repeats itself—did the mass conversions in the time of Constantine the Great prove of help to the Church?

There has been much talk in England about the persecution of the Protestants in Austria, and some militant Protestants in England have been ready enough to believe such stories. I hold no brief for Catholicism, but want only to be fair. I have therefore asked a number of people about this, people some of whom are in an independent position and have unrivalled opportunities of knowing, and others who, though interested parties, are people with exceptional opportunities to find out the truth; and they really all agree in saying that what we mean by persecution in the more technical sense of the word does not exist. It is true that the law requires that a man must give three months' notice of his desire to change his religion, and that this works very much in favour of the Catholics. For when a Catholic goes to the authorities to give this notice, he may in the more outlying parts, where the authorities are often bigoted Catholics, be subjected to much petty persecution. Indeed, I have come across the case of a monk who desired to change his religion: he was locked up in an asylum as being of unsound mind, though he has since been released. On further enquiry, it was admitted that the man had always been regarded as an eccentric. I have heard of one or two cases somewhat similar, where a man was supposed to be a lunatic because he wanted to be a Protestant. A much more serious aspect is that Government employees who are Protestants gain but small promotion, and those who change over are likely to get still less; and undoubtedly in giving out jobs there is discrimination in favour of the Catholics. Under the Socialist Government the Catholics often suffered for going to church, and now, by a swing of the pendulum, they profit by

it. I did hear, however, of a case the other day which shows that there is some fairness in the wireless talks to children on Christmas Day. A Protestant read the Gospel; a well-known Catholic, who often gives talks on the wireless, reported this to Cardinal Mitzer, who is said to be all-powerful here, and the Cardinal rang up the wireless people; but they adhered to their decision, probably, however, with his consent. Indeed, the Cardinal is said to be a man of mild disposition, and it must also be admitted that the Austrian character is adverse to harsh measures against anyone.

But the Papal Nuncio is said to be blacker than the Pope, and the Prince-Bishop of Salzburg, an old man of seventy, only recently appointed, has declared in his cathedral that there will be no Protestants in his diocese in seven years' time, though he has not said how this will come about. A good many of the parish priests, who had to take a back seat in the time of the Socialist Government, cannot now resist the opportunity of retaliating. I believe, however, that when the Austrian Chancellor was in London at the beginning of the year, it was unofficially represented to him that anything in the way of persecution would result in the withdrawal of that popular support for Austria and its cause which it enjoys to-day in England, and which means so much for the maintenance of its independence, as all recognize here, both Government and people.

It is often said — and as far as generalizations can be true this is true — that all Protestants are Nazis. The leaders of the Protestants in the Burgenland, one of the Austrian provinces, in a recent declaration to the Governor of that province, openly stated that their sympathies were Nazi, but since the Government is now organized in a direction contrary to the Nazi system, and not wanting to remain outside the fold, they desire also to confirm their loyalty to the Government and their desire to work with it for the future of Austria, and they hope that the Catholics will be tolerant and accept their aid, and make their task easy. The Catholics are said to have appreciated this offer.

It is easy to see why the Protestants should be Nazi, first and foremost, since by far the greater number of them are Lutheran, and Germany is their spiritual home. Then they are for the most part descendants of Germans who came South to

assist in the manufactures which sprang up here much later than in the North. Many of their pastors, too, have had some, if not all, of their training in German universities, though there is a Protestant faculty attached to the University of Vienna, which does not now stand as high as it used to.

Further, a large number of these mass converts who have come into the Church have, as we have seen, brought with them a political atmosphere. Men with Nazi sympathies naturally preferred joining the Protestant Church to joining the Catholics, if only because the Government to-day is predominantly Catholic, and these Nazis are opposed to the Government, and also to the connection with Italy, which is favoured by the Government, and naturally also by the leaders of the Catholic Church, though by no means by all its members. Otherwise, the Nazis would be but an insignificant minority in Austria to-day, which they certainly are not. Thus these Nazis would have given the Protestant Church a Nazi complexion if it had not had one before.

Many must wonder what effect the persecution of the Church which is going on to-day in Germany has upon the feeling for the *Anschluss*. One would perhaps have thought that this would have made all Church people in Austria, to say nothing of the others, determined to maintain their own independence. It seems, however, that this is not really the case. To begin with, only those Austrians who can read the foreign press know what is happening on the other side of the border, since their own press is strictly censored, and they can only read what the Government allows them to read, and naturally they discount the worth of a good deal of that. Then I am afraid it is true that even if they did know the truth, those of German descent here, as well as many who feel kinship with them owing to a common language and a common history over many centuries, are ready to put the doctrine of 'blood and soil' before almost everything else, and to excuse all manner of excesses committed in its name. This was one of my great surprises. Indeed, I think it is for all of us one of the greatest surprises of the century to learn what a deep hold this, to us, fantastic doctrine has taken of the German people, and it will prove perhaps the most lasting thing of all the tricks which Herr Hitler has produced out of his showman's hat. It has undoubtedly an enormous hold on the youth

here, though it is not politic to speak of it openly; but it has divided members of a household so that they are scarcely on speaking terms with one another, and it has with many taken the place of religion. The National Patriotic Front with all their Government support made, I fear, poor headway against it. It is helped, too, by the Austrian's incapacity for self-help: for centuries he drew support from the great Empire over which his house ruled, and now that has gone. He must lean on someone —on England; or Italy; on the League of Nations; but a very large number look to their big neighbour, Germany, with its specious promises, as their one hope in their time of trouble. Religion is thus made subservient for many reasons to political ends.

If we ask what sort of religion is taught in the Protestant churches here, my ignorance of German prevents me from speaking at first hand; but I gather that the Protestant pastors rely much on long and eloquent sermons, in the preparation of which much time is consumed, to exert an influence on their people. Music is but little employed, and though a church may have a good choir, this functions only on great occasions, and the pastor is a man who lives a good deal aloof from the people, spending his time chiefly between his study, his family and the elect. Neither in society itself, nor in the various groups and societies to which I belong, and which are mostly predominantly Austrian, do I come across a pasteur or a curé, and I think my presence there often causes a mild surprise, as if it were unusual for clergy to take part in such mundane affairs. Undoubtedly I have more time at my disposal than many of these people have, but I doubt if that is the only reason, or whether they have the ideal of an English parish priest to mix freely with his people both at work and at play. The Roman curé's abstention is understandable—it results from a long tradition which he may not break if he would; but with the Protestant pasteur the tradition, for tradition it is, could be broken. But although these pasteurs are continually declaiming against Rome, and waste much of their energy, and create unnecessary hostility not only among the Catholics but among outsiders, by so doing, I think that on the Continent they are unconsciously largely influenced by her, and certainly in this withdrawing from social life. I occasionally

read the leading Protestant monthly magazine, and here again I note the articles belong to a type perhaps popular in English religious magazines half a century ago, with abundant use of texts to prove their thesis, which is often some particular point against Rome—articles obviously written for 'the elect,' but which could make no impression on the youth, who probably do not accept any longer the Bible, or at any rate a literal interpretation of it, and, even if they did so, would find the article unbelievably dull. Some of the town pastors, I am told, are too much addicted to the Higher Criticism, thus going to the other extreme. Many of the country clergy are exceedingly poor—though this, I am told, is not true of the town clergy—and this no doubt greatly cripples their work.

I have now seen Protestantism at work in many countries of Europe, and I have always tried, and have succeeded, in making many good friends among both pasteurs and laity; but I find the same difficulties repeating themselves in all these countries. First I should put lack of organization: each pasteur and congregation go their own way, more or less indifferent to the rest, the rich ones doing little to help the poor and struggling ones. There is a central organization, but its control is weak, its powers exercised by boards and committees who shirk responsibility. One is almost driven to believe in episcopacy, even if one were in theory opposed to it, and to see the advantage of one man exercising effective control. With lack of organization goes a lack of anything like a standard of teaching—the pasteurs seem to hold all faiths or none; like one pasteur, a very earnest and kindly little man, who before saying the Creed told his congregation he would repeat it but that he did not believe it, and who had four children before he thought it necessary to have any of them baptized. I could mention other absurdities. I should like to see, not only in Austria, but in each country in Europe, Lutherans and Calvinists become one, since their differences to-day are no longer real; and each country have its own bishop, with a central Council of Bishops meeting every year in Geneva, reviewing the position for Europe as a whole, and sending missions of help to those countries which were for the moment hard-pressed. Above all, I should like to see Protestants tackle the question of the universities, which they nowhere do. Here in Vienna, as

everywhere else, little or nothing is done to deal with the student at the most critical time in his life. No wonder students become Bolshevists, Communists, Nazis, etc.; their idealism must flow along some channel, and because the task is hard their religious leaders desert them when most they are needed. Twelve thousand students coming from all countries in Europe offer, one may well believe, a splendid opportunity for influencing not only Austria, but many other countries as well.

The Old Catholic Church is here, and has made also considerable advance, having added some 6,000 to their numbers in consequence of the above-mentioned governmental edict. This has necessitated building another church in Vienna, and some of the money for this was found in England, where, as is well known, the National Church has entered into a formal union with the Old Catholics. I do not know, however, whether they have a great future here or elsewhere: if a man breaks away from Rome he goes far to the Left, as it were, to the extreme Protestants; or to atheism: and we may say, conversely, that Centre parties neither politically nor religiously seem to have a great future, though they may play a very important part in the near future. Only two months ago the Old Catholic bishop and two of his priests, all robed, took part in the ceremony in the English Church when the Bishop of Fulham inducted me into the chaplaincy here. Never before had such a thing occurred in Vienna, and this visible sign of unity with them of the great Church of England made a great impression on the Old Catholics.

The Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the Quakers, the Salvation Army, and various other religious influences are at work here; but they do not seem to count for much in Austria as a whole, and I only mention them to show that I have not lost sight of them. It was in Austria that I first faced the Jewish problem, and that people first asked me when speaking of a person whether he were or were not a Jew. If he is, in the eyes of many people, including the Nazis, of course, he is damned no matter how excellent his qualities. There is, I believe, a certain mild persecution of the Jews in that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for them to hold any office under the Government, including the opera, and they suffer a good deal of social ostracism; but I think that is the worst that can be said. There are also two societies at

work, one from London and the other from Sweden, which aim at converting them to Christianity, and they meet, I believe, with a good measure of success. That success would, I am convinced, be overwhelmingly great if sincere Christians, no matter of what Church, made an effort to treat them with that kindness and courtesy which we ought to show to one another, for I do not find that the synagogue holds any attraction for the majority of the educated young Jews, and many seem very sympathetic towards a Christianity, not of the mission hall type, but that of the ordinary church where there is friendliness within and without.

But over ninety per cent. of Austrians are Roman Catholics, and most of them would like to live and die as such, though those who practise it with anything like regularity are but a minority, though a considerable minority. The great quarrel they have with their Church is that it will involve itself in politics. To-day the Church rules Austria, and if you are a Catholic your political views are presented to you ready-made, whether they fit you or not. If, as is possible by another turn of the wheel of fortune, the present Government is driven out, one cannot be surprised if the next Government persecutes the Church, and all is thrown into confusion. It is curious that Rome, with its supposed long view of things, does not see this, nor learn the lessons of Spain, Mexico, and France in modern times, and, leaving aside temporal power, which is ephemeral, seek the spiritual power which is eternal.

Not everyone sees things from the same angle, and few, perhaps, would concur in all that I have said. I have merely endeavoured to put together the results of my own reflections, and of many talks with all kinds of people, many of whom, because they did not know I was seeking information, gave it the more readily and the more fully.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CREEDS*

By the Rev. T. J. Wood, M.A., *Vicar of St. John's, Clapham; Organizing Secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union.*

'Howbeit when He the Spirit of Truth is come He shall guide you into all the truth.'—St. John xvi, 13.

UNDER the conviction that the Bible was the verbal and infallible oracle of God it was treated as an armoury of proof texts, and from this text it has been argued that, since Christ had promised that the Holy Spirit should guide His Church into all the truth, therefore what the Church proclaimed at any period was necessarily the truth. Whence emerges that delusion which has so often misled the Church, that of infallibility. One would like to believe that the influence of this delusion was confined to one great branch of the Christian Church and to obscure and unprogressive sections of Fundamentalism, but that is not the case; many people when they think of Christianity think of it as a body of doctrine imparted by God Himself to the Church in some miraculous manner which guarantees its truth. Its formularies consequently are irreformable, and any attempt to question these standards, or to depart from their literalness, is regarded as disloyalty to Christ. We frequently meet in sectarian newspapers the view that our Church is irrevocably committed to the credal forms in which the Christian tradition has been inherited by us, whether it be the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, or the ancient Creeds of the Apostles and Nicea: and the average member of the Church of England still believes that by the repetition of the Creeds we are committed to the literal acceptance of all the statements, historical and doctrinal, contained in them. Such a view is of course not possible to anyone who has an intelligent knowledge of the history of doctrine, but its persistence is one of the greatest hindrances to the effectiveness of the Church's appeal to the present generation. It is this incorrect view of Christian dogma which keeps so many people from active membership of the Church.

* A sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday morning, April 7th, 1935.

This is the reason for taking as a subject what must appear to some to be a well-worn theme.

Surely, it will be said, we have reached a stage in religious toleration in this country when the danger for the Church lies not in excess of dogmatism so much as in credal nebulosity; but the false ideal of dogmatic uniformity is still a millstone about the Church's neck, and we need continually to recall ourselves to the fundamental difference between the Christian Faith and the Creeds in which it is enshrined (and in some entombed).

It is significant that the first attempt to draw up a Creed for the whole of Christendom was due to an unbaptized imperial dictator. Dictators have no use for freedom of thought, either in the fourth century or the twentieth. The passion for uniformity of doctrine necessarily leads to persecution, and has been productive of the most deplorably unchristian acts that Christians have ever committed in the name of Christ. Yet to-day there are still some who would identify membership of the Christian Church with acceptance of certain Creeds and formularies, and the problem of the relation of the Christian faith to the Creeds is one of the most urgent which faces the Church at the present time. This has been acknowledged by the appointment by the Archbishops of a Commission to deal with the doctrine of the Church of England, and the Report of this Commission may be hoped for during the next two years. It may be open to question whether in the swirling eddies of modern thought, with the undigested accumulations of knowledge, with its absence of any clear philosophical basis, the present is the most suitable time in which to embark upon a re-statement of Christian doctrine, but an even greater danger seems to lie in the absolute unpreparedness of the Church public to face the issues involved or to understand the method of approach and the points upon which changes are most urgently needed.

It is very desirable that it should be made clear, both to those within the Church and to those outside it, that a profound change has come over theological circles in the attitude towards the authority of the Creeds and the sense in which they are to be interpreted. The Archbishop of York dealt very fully with this question in his recently published Gifford Lectures, and drew attention to a distinction which must be constantly remembered

and brought home to people. He emphasises the distinction between a divine revelation and the Creeds which are the intellectual embodiment of what is conceived to be the truth of that revelation. He points out that since God is personal, revelation is an act of God which is apprehended in a complete living experience. As we are rational beings we are bound to endeavour to express the inference drawn from revelation in the formulae which we call Creeds, but the Creeds are not the revelation. They point the way towards the experience which was the revelation.

This distinction between the divine revelation in Christ and the Creeds in which the Church has attempted to express its understanding of that revelation is one which must be pressed home. As the Archbishop says: ' . . . there is no such thing as revealed truth. There are truths of revelation.'[1] The Archbishop himself points out that there is no disloyalty to the acknowledged revelation in the enquiry whether its contents may not now or in the future be more accurately or more usefully formulated than hitherto. That some of the articles of the Creeds cannot be accepted in their literal form is generally now acknowledged; no one believes literally such articles as the resurrection of the body, the descent into hell; but the need for recognizing the right to a symbolical interpretation of the Creeds goes much deeper than this. We live in an intellectual atmosphere quite unknown to the composers of the Creeds. The whole theological vocabulary of *ousia* and *hypostasis* and of substance and subsistence are impossible as *media* for the expression of the view of God to-day.

One cannot insist too strongly that the self-revelation of God did not come to an end with the year 451 or 1600. The limitation of the meaning of orthodoxy to that which was taught in the early Church would be to cramp the Church within the swaddling clothes of its infancy. As Christians we are bound to believe in the continuous and progressive revelation of God through the continuous work of the Holy Spirit, and there can be no doubt that the knowledge which has been gained in all spheres of life during the last century has at least an equal, and in many cases a greater, claim to be regarded as knowldge of the revelation of

[1] Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, p. 317.

God than much that was considered true either in the fourth or the sixteenth century.

The Church of England, therefore, should stand for a wide diversity of thought. This Church has proudly boasted of its comprehensiveness, but comprehensiveness varies inversely as the rigidity of dogma, and rigidity of dogma has no part in the spirit of Christ. There are some who would like to see the ancient Creeds relegated, as it were, to an appendix, to a Museum of Theological Antiquities, only to be used on special ceremonial occasions. There is something to be said for the less frequent repetition of the Creeds in the Services of the Church, but it would be difficult to secure approval of their complete removal from the public worship of the Church. There are some who would like to see other forms of Creeds substituted for, or used as alternatives for, the ancient ones, forms more in accordance with modern thought, forms which a man can use without insulting his intelligence, forms which really say what they mean and mean what they say.

The way out of the difficulty is suggested by the Report on the Church's Common Confession of Faith, which was accepted *nem con* at a full Session of the Lausanne Conference of 1927, and has since received approval by the Lambeth Conference and been embodied in the South India Scheme of Reunion. That Report said :

> 'We are united in a common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Ecumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed, which Faith is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ.
>
> 'We believe that the Holy Spirit in leading the Church into all truth may enable it, while firmly adhering to the witness of these Creeds (our common heritage from the ancient Church), to express the truths of revelation in such other forms as new problems may from time to time demand.'

In these words the distinction between the revelation of God in Christ and the expression of the meaning of that revelation in Creeds is accepted. The Creeds are not the Christian Faith, but they witness to it, they safeguard it. Obviously the weight traditionally attached to the actual words of the Creeds ceases to be of the greatest importance. The individual is free to interpret the precise meaning of the metaphors of the Creeds in rela-

tion to his own philosophy. Creeds are no longer fourth century stained-glass windows which we may look at; they are the prisms *through* which we may look at the light of God which shines in Christ. They refract the white light of eternity into the rainbow colours of time.

This way of regarding the Creeds would seem to be a valuable approach to two important tasks which confront the Church. The first is that of Christian unity. There is probably no defect in the Churches of the present day which stands out in such striking contrast to the spirit of the Lord as our disunity, and there is no action which could convince the world of the sincerity of our Christian profession so much as the reunion of the Churches of Christendom. Our disunion is the product of the zeal for uniformity which history shows always to bring in its train compulsion and persecution. Non-conformity becomes consecrated by the blood of its martyrs and sectarianism becomes a sacred tradition. There are those among us to-day who maintain that it is impossible to share Communion with those who do not think exactly like ourselves. Such a view is obviously disproved by the variety of opinions held within the Church of England itself among those who normally communicate together. The attempt to use the proposals for reunion as a means for securing a narrower basis of doctrine is destined to failure. It is obvious that the unity of the Christian Church can only be brought about upon a credal basis which, while revering the traditional forms, is sufficiently wide to embrace all who are prepared to accept the supreme revelation of God in Christ. Such a basis is provided by the Lausanne formula, and it is to be hoped that all parties within the Church of England as well as the Free Churches may find their common ground therein.

The second task of the Church to-day is so to interpret the Faith of Christ to the world of this generation that it will win acceptance. We have been told that what is wrong with the world to-day is that it has lost its religion. While civilization has advanced, while man's power over nature and his ability to produce the goods that he needs have increased by leaps and bounds, he has lost the sense of purpose which could inspire his activity and direct his ends. A Christian civilization can only be upheld by Christian ideals. The greater its powers the greater

need of a deep sense of purpose in personal and social life. But the world has lost the sense of the relationship to a divine purpose which upheld and inspired the civilizations of old. Nothing but the Christian Faith is capable of becoming the guiding power and inspiration of this civilization, which without that civilization must lose itself in futile activity and end in self-destruction. But what Christian Faith are we to give it? Can it be the Faith presented to it in terms and forms of the Roman Empire of the fourth century A.D.? Can we believe that a Church which was capable morally of tolerating the vast abuses which marked that Empire is adequate, intellectually or morally, to inspire the twentieth century? Must we not return, as every religious revival has turned, to the source and fount of faith, which is not the Creeds, nor even the Bible? The Source of the Christian Faith is not a Book, nor a Creed, but a Person; a living Person, who said to His disciples, not 'Rehearse the Articles of the Christian Faith,' but 'Come, follow Me.'

We owe it to the modern spirit, with its passion for scientific truth and intellectual honesty, to present the Truth as it is in Christ in an intelligible form, free from sophistries. We owe it to Christ Himself to let men see Him for themselves, not encumbered with the cerecloths of ecclesiastical controversies.

It is the duty of every generation of Christians to seek the Spirit of Christ for itself, and to interpret that Spirit in relation to the knowledge and the circumstances of its own time. Let us look forward to a Church which shall be truly Catholic, not by its rigid adherence to traditional formularies, but by its comprehension of all the truth which God has ever revealed to men, and by its consecration of every activity in which men can truly serve God.

Christ's promise that the Spirit should lead the Church into all the truth has not yet been fulfilled — it can never be fulfilled until the final and complete Vision of God, which is the hope of the blessed.

THE NEW BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

By T. Wigley, M.A., author of *A New Highway towards Christian Reality.*

> 'To-day we are in the midst of a religious revolution, which is going on so quietly that many do not notice it, although it is a greater and more fundamental revolution than any since the early years of the Christian era.'

So writes E. G. Conklin in his book, *The Direction of Human Evolution.* He then asks this question:

> 'Can Christianity become the religion of reason and science as well as of emotion and faith, and be made the power for individual and social progress which its founder intended?'

On our answer to this question will depend the future, not only of the modern mind, but of the modern world, for unless Christian thought can adapt itself to its new environment, Christian thought will cease to be thought and will become the mechanical repetition of meaningless forms and ceremonies from which the life has long since departed. We must stress the fact that it is impossible for an organism to exist apart from its environment, and it can never be understood divorced from this intimate relationship. This is true whether we think of protozoa and metazoa, or of a body of thought calling itself Christian. Exactly in the same way as cell-growth takes place following the colloidal organization of the ground-substance, so particular systems of thought are built up by functional adaptation to and stimulation by what we may call the surrounding masses of the contemporary thought-whole. There is no fixity, for in the give and take of organism and environment there takes place a gradual elaboration of components not present at any previous stage. The fact that explanted tissue fragments become disorganized and chaotic is not without its moral for those who imagine that Christian thought is a deposit which can be perpetuated, untouched by the world-view of succeeding ages. We need to distinguish carefully between religion and its expression in institutions, rites or doctrines, and we do an ill service to religion when we insist that statements concerning it, serviceable

enough in other days, are binding on the minds of men to-day. It is the presence of this pernicious attitude which is the cause of much present alienation. To transform doctrine into dogma, whether by ecclesiastical or other authority, means the death of all mental activity. Did not Professor E. C. Moore once remark that dogma is that part of doctrine concerning which men have forgotten that it had a history, and have decided that it shall have no more? It is to confound statements of truth with truth itself, to demand credence instead of faith. Sabatier also reminds us:

> 'The Christian plants have all sprung from the same seed, but they vary according to the soil in which they grow. They are all of the same species, but in that species there are innumerable varieties. How could the external result have been the same whether the divine seed fell into the heart of a simple fisherman of Galilee, or a rabbi of genius, or a thinker brought up in the school of Alexandria?'

Christian thought, then, has been most worthy of the name when it has been prepared to incorporate within itself the enlarging knowledge of its time and to adapt itself to broadening horizons. Neither in the first nor the fifth centuries, nor in the twentieth century, can we cry 'lo, here,' 'lo, there,' and point to the final and complete truth; we must be content with approximations, sensitive to the changes of emphasis demanded by the environment in which our life is lived. Actually this has always been the case. The roots of Christianity are embedded deeply in Hebrew religion, and who can measure the influence of the psalms, still used in Christian worship, the 'prophetic' anticipations still beloved by conservative minds, and the hard legalism which is not infrequently to be found even among Christians? The most cursory reader of the New Testament records is soon made aware that their writers regarded the Hebrew Scriptures as full of predictions concerning Jesus's life and work. Here was fulfilment, and the Primitive Church spent much of its time in searching the Scriptures for the evidence. Now, every theological student in his first year's study learns that the text of the Gospels themselves has undoubtedly been influenced by this desire to find fulfilment. Here is adaptation which the modern mind finds it hard to appreciate, in spite of the declaration in the Nicene Creed, 'The third day He rose again according to the Scriptures,' the reference being to *I Cor.* xv, 4, where Paul is

probably thinking of *Hosea* vi, 2. Those who are familiar with recent study of the Gospels, especially with the school of what is called 'Form-Criticism,' which urges that all the materials we possess for a life of Jesus are isolated and fragmentary traditions, will appreciate Professor George H. C. Macgregor's statement in his Inaugural Lecture at Glasgow. After referring to the hushing of the premature rejoicings of twenty-five years ago that the problem of gospel origins had been solved, he said:

> 'To-day we are more humble. . . The synoptics themselves are seen to be religious books composed in the form of history, and from materials which may well be largely historical, but coloured also by theological ideas. . . To-day we no longer study the Gospels in isolation, but in relation to a mass of analogous material which increases in volume every year.'

In connection with the study of the Gospels, therefore, there is no place for dogmatic finality.

The first Christians undoubtedly organized the statements of their faith out of the elements of a Messianic hope which had behind it many changeful years of development, and it is more than probable that they emphasized those aspects of the teaching of Jesus which best fitted in with their own anticipations and background. Apart from this background much of our New Testament literature is not to be understood, especially as this later became affected by Graeco-Roman contacts. And while Christianity was from the first a religion of redemption, this idea of it was increasingly stressed as it strove to meet the needs of a deliverance-seeking world, to which the Mystery Religions were already offering themselves as ways of life. These religions spoke of rebirth and a divine indwelling, and promised immortality. Without venturing to express an opinion on the influence which these religions may have had upon Christian thought, we can at least say that the Christian appeal was shaped to meet the same needs which called them into being, and in its statement was affected by them. As we consider the action and reaction of Christian thought and its environments during the early centuries we may well exclaim:

> 'If the first three Christian centuries could have made possible a more sympathetically intimate and creative alliance of religion and civilization, it would be impossible to calculate the result.'

With the fourth and succeeding centuries we reach the age of creed-making, during which orthodoxy becomes more import-

ant than truth. Harnack gives us ten factors which go to the making of a creed: (1) the Scriptures; (2) traditions; (3) needs of worship and organization; (4) the adjustment of conceptions of religion to doctrinal opinions; (5) political and social circumstances; (6) changing moral ideals; (7) desire for logical consistency; (8) reconciliation of factions; (9) to get rid of error; (10) sanctifying power of blind custom. Here we have a statement of background ever changing which gradually altered the first simple creed of the Jewish-Christian Church, 'I believe that Jesus is the Christ,' into that exposition of Christian thought commonly called 'the Creed of Saint Athanasius.' Authority was called in to enforce the truth alleged; those who denied were anathematized by a Church become credo-centric. Christian thought thus became concerned, not with systematizing knowledge, but with systematizing unquestioning belief, until at last Christian devotion was to be measured by Christian credulity. We may admit the need for doctrinal backbone, but a backbone which is so rigid that its owner cannot bend is more of a hindrance than a help in the expression of life. Nor is sameness synonymous with continuity. Even the Reformation was not the clean break with the past which many Protestants imagine it to have been, and Protestant thinkers, proud as we are told they were of their agreement with the Fathers of the Early Church, failed to see how much they had in common with the Roman in their ideas of inspiration and revelation, of God and man, of nature and salvation. These ideas continued to dominate the religious thought of men up to the eighteenth century, when in the name of rationalism men began to free themselves from the fetters of an intolerant dogmatism, whether Roman or Protestant. A. C. McGiffert points out that the reason why rationalism ultimately made its home in Protestantism rather than in the older communion was not because the former was in principle more tolerant of divergent views, but because the divisions within the Protestant ranks made greater tolerance a necessity. This was a wholesome leaven in the lump which claimed that what was human could not be divine, and that the divine was necessarily the opposite of the human. When, as a result of the work of the founders of the sciences, men learnt that a cosmogony which had been assumed for centuries as true was false,

important repercussions followed in Christian thought. Even Newton, in spite of his simple piety, was accused of being a Unitarian! To be scientific was to be unorthodox.

It calls for an effort on our part to realise the completeness of the concrete shelter which the Church had built for the protection of the faith, and which for the majority lasted far into the nineteenth century unaffected by any new theory of knowledge or scientific thought. Everything was so simple and fitted together so well. The world was man's stage, on which man was to play his part of glorifying God. Admittedly, man and his stage were partially in ruins because of Adam's sin, but the situation had been met, and a programme of salvation presented the fated unfolding of the drama. Heaven rewarded the faithful, and Hell loomed dark and final before the sinner. Man's little stage was the centre of a little universe, which was the sole object of God's thought and care. Then changes began to take place. The study of the Bible by means of the historical and scientific method has had results on our ideas of revelation and inspiration, which even to-day have not yet permeated the popular mind. Theologians themselves would appear to be singularly fearful of making quite clear the immeasurable consequences for Christian thought of our altered view of the character and origin of the varied contents of the Bible. Silence, however, on this subject is tantamount to dishonesty, and when appeal is made to the Scriptures as unanswerable and final, we can characterize such an attitude by no other name. It is surely time that the tacit ignoring of the ascertained results of Biblical study, which have been known for decades, ceased among responsible religious teachers. I know of no greater hindrance to the cause of true religion than the permitted survival of old assumptions with regard to the Bible, which cloud the mental and moral sense and make possible those attempts at harmonizing Biblical statements with modern knowledge, which rightly bring religion into disrepute among intelligent people. Mental dishonesty is a charge not lightly to be incurred.

We call ours a scientific age. The expression may be more an aspiration than a fact so far as the majority is concerned, since they are more familiar with the practical applications of scientific method than with that method itself, but it is true

enough of the creative minority which is the salt of every age. The minority is for ever enlarging its numbers in this age of rapid means of communication, mental and physical, and it will not be long before the ideas of the minority are the commoplaces of the majority. It has been said that:

> 'The philosophical revolution inaugurated by Kant, with the general drift toward monism in the interpretation of the universe, separates from their forbears men who have lived since Kant, by a greater interval than that which divided Kant from Plato. The evolutionary view of nature, as developed from Schelling and Comte through Darwin to Bergson, divides men now living from the contemporaries of Kant in his youthful studies of nature, as those men were not divided from the followers of Aristotle.'

I would add that the changes demanded by recent work in mathematical physics, no less than in genetics and the mechanism of creative evolution, separate the thought of to-day equally at least from the nineteenth century as that century was separated from mediaevalism. For those unfamiliar with these new movements of thought it would be useless to attempt to describe them briefly in the course of a paper which is primarily concerned with religious implications. Many excellent books, as difficult to read as they are valuable, can be obtained. On the physical side, Jeans's *The New Background of Science* may be confidently recommended, and on the general biological background the symposium, *Science in the Changing World*, makes easy reading.

Recognizing the danger of generalizations, I would venture to say, following Bertalanffy's studies in modern theories of development, that the main idea which is gradually becoming dominant in the sciences is that of wholeness. The naïve 'additive' point of view, which regarded anything as merely the sum of its parts, is rapidly making way for the view which takes organization into account. The analysis of single partial processes tells us nothing about the characteristically vital order any more than a musical composition can be known essentially by measurements of the pitch of single notes. According to K. Sapper in his *Philosophy of Organisms*, we may picture an organism as a system of 'configurations' in which every higher group in the ladder of levels — electron, atom, molecule, cell, tissue, organ, organism — exhibits specifically new modes of action which cannot be understood as mere additive phenomena from the previous ones. This 'Gestalt theory,' as it is called,

arose in psychology in recognition of the defective atomism of associationism, and is especially linked with the name of Wolfgang Köhler. We appear to be driven to conceiving of reality as a series of distinct but not unrelated processes which for convenience of study may be isolated from each other, but are not in any sense explainable apart from their relationships to the whole. 'Development is, at last, epigenesis, *i.e.* neoformation of manifoldness.' We are reminded of A. N. Whitehead's claim that we directly perceive what he calls a 'relationship of conformation' in the world. Things do not 'simply occur'; they conform to previous occurrences. Nothing exists in isolation; everything exists in relationships, and the whole universe is in every event. We can therefore understand Whitehead's rejection of the Aristotelean idea of God as Prime Mover, which still dominates popular theology, and his substitution of God as the Principal of Concretion, which finds a place for moral and aesthetic values as integral constituents of reality. It is a step pregnant with possibilities when the new idea of organism replaces the old idea of matter. 'There are no single occasions, in the sense of isolated occasions,' says Whitehead;

> 'actuality is through and through togetherness — togetherness of otherwise isolated eternal objects, and togetherness of all actual occasions.'

Have we not here a background favourable to a view which will reconcile the God revealed in Nature with the God revealed in man's highest experiences? And, if this is so, is it not time that we openly abandoned those traditional types of argument which, as Bishop Barnes says in his Gifford Lectures on *Scientific Theory and Religion*, give the impression that the Christian idea of God is derived from Jewish cosmology, and that not only this idea but other ideas as well would not be true unless the stories of the Creation and the Fall were in substance historical facts? The mind which finds its science and religion in Hebrew myth and legend has for too long been a hindrance to men, and if a way is to be cleared through the tangled undergrowth of centuries along which the feet of the future may pass, Barnes's judgment must be heeded by those who would serve to-day and to-morrow.

> 'Any scheme of theology must, to be adequate, take account of the way in which God has fashioned and controls the universe, and must therefore be permeated by the new knowledge. Without exaggeration,

> we can assert that man's spiritual experience is as unreal as a dream unless the God to whom it leads him is also the God whose nature is shown in the universe as a whole.'

The idea of a Creator dwelling somewhere aloof above the stars can no more be believed to-day than the idea of the manlike Being who walked in the garden of Eden conversing with Adam and Eve. The powerful, popular tendency towards isolating the religious history and thought of one people, called the Hebrews, from those of other nations, the isolating of God from the world, and Jesus from man, are examples of theological departmentalizing which must be frankly given up as morally, no less than mentally, unclean. This impossible attempt to regard 'events' in isolation is the natural consequence of the way in which Christian thought has so often endeavoured to isolate itself from other knowledges, claiming indeed to have dealings with a unique realm of reality, which in its turn stimulated a unique response called religious. Here, it seemed, was a position of invulnerability not to be lightly let go. Dr. F. R. Tennant's demolition of this position lacks nothing in completeness, and has contributed greatly to that cleansing of the theological ground so much to be desired. If the static isolationists in theology had not had their way so long unchallenged, there would have been less force in Whitehead's pungent criticism that,

> 'religion is tending to degenerate into a decent formula wherewith to embellish a comfortable life,'

than at present there is. Nor would Dr. Major have needed to ask in his little book on the creeds,

> 'Why should the Incarnation be tied to the Virgin birth? Why should Divine judgment be tied to a Great Assize? Why should personal immortality be tied to a Resurrection of Relics?'

We may well echo 'why?' Even the ordinary man is asking that question, as he slowly becomes conscious that worship is degenerating into 'commemoration,' a 'monument of absent realities,' and

> 'serves at best to keep alive, like an anniversary, the remembrance of things else fading in the distance.'

I am indebted to Professor G. Dawes Hicks for pointing this out. Christian thought will either prove itself to be alive by its new formations affecting both content and form, or it will be rejected as inadequate by the modern mind. It is still true, as Edward Caird said, that a man's religion is the expression of his

ultimate attitude to the universe, the summed-up meaning and purport of his whole consciousness of things, and that consciousness is grown beyond the conceiving of any previous generation; our Christian thought is to be big enough to meet this situation. The choice lies between the asylum of authority and the appeal of adventure. There can, I think, be no question as to which is the more Christian way.

If the good life is worth living, men want to know the reason why, and our answer will depend on what we know about the world in which that life is to be lived. It is refreshing to be reminded by Herrmann in his famous book on *The Communion of the Christian with God* that

> 'Mere emotion cannot raise us into a new life, for mere emotion leaves us alone with ourselves and with what we have already attained, and nothing more. Greater and higher than all religious emotion within the Christian there rises and towers religious thought, which points past all that we have already felt and experienced to a boundless wealth that lies beyond.'

His words might well be used to control the tendency towards spiritual exihibitionism in the flight from reason, to which many are prone. Again, however much we may honour the great names of the past, we must remember that we live in our age and not in theirs, and while the theology of the Primitive or Early Church is interesting historically, it has no authority to bind our minds to-day. If we are right in asserting that the law of development is the key and the interpretation of life, we are compelled to add that the refusal to progress in religious thinking is a denial of the living God and of His law. The appeal to truth is the appeal most truly Christian in the twentieth century as well as in the first. We are as free to-day to redefine our faith, as free to call to our aid the knowledge and thought-forms of our age, as the men of any previous generation. We must dare to use our understanding before we join the ranks of those whose cry, 'forward through the back door,' leads to the desert.

We shall seriously miss our way if we do not grasp the fundamental idea of a process in the universal, in linked stages of which the inorganic and the organic find their places. The idea of evolution is statement of fact, and modern investigation is rapidly throwing fresh light on the intricate factors involved in it, and showing that we must regard the process as essentially

creative. We are concerned, not with mere changeableness, for in man at any rate questions of interpretation, value and assessment are inevitably raised. Physically regarded, the process may be viewed as the manifestation of the working of infinite energy. Matter is now seen to be neither dull, inert nor irrational, and recent physics appears to have disposed of any sort of materialism, leading us rather to an ultimate world-ground expressing itself in mathematical terms. While no one should be so foolish as to attempt to rehabilitate the arguments of Paley by placing the finger of God among the genes, the observed linkage of the inorganic with organic, and the broadly progressive character of the process, so far as our experience goes, gives us the impression of movement in a psychical direction. Successive forms are characterized by a growing measure of control over themselves and over their environments, with which they come into an ever closer and richer contact. Organically, advancing forms show greater complexity and integration of structure, a more complete command over surroundings, a growing self-determination with developing power to modify present expression in the light of past experience, and consciousness of an end to be attained. The movement is towards 'wholeness' through contacts real and ideal. Going beyond science in the narrow use of the term, are we not justified in assuming that we have to do with a Creative Activity which is slowly working out a great idea dimly perceived and shared by us? Is not this Activity mindful? That the universe is intelligible few will be so nescient as to deny, in view of the fact that the physical basis is proved to be of a mathematical order, that definite quantities, proportions and relationships are everywhere revealed. The structure of the universe appears more and more to conform to the structure of exact thought.

It is not remarkable that we should find it difficult to form a clear idea of the relation of mind to this infinite energy, since we cannot explain the exact relation of our own minds to the muscles which enable us to lift a cup of tea to our lips. As Professor E. D. Adrian said in an article in *Nature* on the 'Mechanism of the Nerves,'

> 'emotions and thoughts are in a category outside the range of mechanical explanation, and for this reason the working of the nervous system will never be fully explainable in terms of physics and chemistry.'

We note the failure of the same type of explanation when we consider the liver-cells, in which at least ten vital chemical processes take place in a space no greater than about one hundred-thousandth part of a pin's head. We speak of a machine 'fiction,' but not of a machine theory. To derive mind from 'matter' or 'energy' is an impossibility. In some way, then, and in some degree man must be regarded as representing a part or aspect of the truth concerning the whole. Man, who is, be it remembered, a genetic product of the process, must mirror in his own mind at least something of its essential nature. Can we not go even further and say that over the whole, in all its elaboration, those values which man calls moral become increasingly significant? Is the process not making for the realization of the good, the beautiful and the true? If these have not survival value, it is indeed strange that men should have come to associate progress with them. A process which is a rational, orderly whole has tremendous possibilities in it which emerge at every stage. It becomes more meaningful when we reflect that it is the law of organisms that they react to a stimulating and supporting environment. The urge towards an end is characteristic of living things, and the higher we ascend the scale of animal life, the more coherent and consistent becomes the end which is sought, both real and ideal. We are compelled to ask ourselves what is the nature of this reality which thus expresses itself in a stretching out on the one side and a beckoning on the other, and issues in the attainment already noted. Present-day biology is rapidly undergoing a new orientation under the influence of organismic theories, and in this department of knowledge our idea of mechanical routine is seen to be less and less adequate. It is even less adequate when we approach psychology, and it is ruled completely out of court as a philosophical world-view. At least we must think of the whole as a creative, progressive mind with all the implications which lie in the use of such words. To that extent, I suggest, the natural sciences can themselves supply the reasonable guarantee, which, as F. R. Tennant claims, neither ethics nor religious experience alone can provide, and may give ground for religious belief or hope.

> 'The very sciences from which certain schools would cut theology loose may thus afford the only indisputable facts, by building on which theology can become a body of reasonable beliefs for the guidance of

life. Natural theology, apart from the sciences, is baseless: natural science, stopping short of a theistic culmination, has the appearance of an arbitrarily arrested growth.'

The question may well be asked, if we use the word 'God' at all, can we mean anything more than the sum total we call the whole, or is there a Divine Nature, a transcendent Godhead immanently related to the process, apart from which it is unintelligible? We shall appreciate our possible answer by recalling that during the eighteenth century what is known as classical mechanism held the field and of necessity led to a frankly deistic idea of God. In familiar language, the Creator was conceived as One who determined the laws of the world events, building up His giant machine at some particular point in time. Such a God could have for man merely an historical interest, and, as Goethe asked, 'What sort of a God were He, who only worked from outside?' Actually, theologians felt the difficulty of such a view, and urged that God could be seen at work in the development of life from dead matter, or mind from life, of spirituality from animality. The finger of God was to be seen in the special creation of each species and of every human being, in various alleged miracles, but especially in the so-called plan of salvation whereby man might alone be redeemed. This theology, intimately related to a particular background of knowledge long outgrown, may still be regarded as orthodoxy in the majority of the churches, at whose doors modern knowledge knocks in vain. It is perhaps best described as *multiple deism*, though doubtless those who profess it would not so describe their theological position. God is thought of as creating in single definite acts at quite definite times. We cannot, however, continue to assume the truth of such an idea in the light of what is known to-day, and if our children are to be religious at all another and truer theology must be worked out. Such a new theology will certainly not limit the action of God to individual acts performed from without, but will regard the whole process, in its entirety and without exception, as dependent upon God. We are led to panentheism, and the idea of maintenance takes the place of the idea of creation. B. Bavink rightly urges that,

'For present-day physics the contingency of being is distributed quite evenly over the whole course of the world. From this point of view it is therefore meaningless to regard only an initial state as settled

> by God, and the whole remaining course as that of a clock running down. God's working upon the world must not be regarded from the human standpoint of time. According to the theory of relativity, time, like space, literally is just as much a part of the world as a magnetic field is part of a magnet. Where there is no matter there is also no space and no time, and there is no obstacle to our regarding time in the non-euclidian sense, for example, as finite and returning upon itself, and in others also. It is obvious that on this basis such questions as the famous one as to what God did before He created the world are completely nonsensical.'

All the old ideas of God being somewhere outside in space, which still dominate much religious thought and expression, must be dismissed as impossible, in spite of the fact that the great systems of Christian thought have been built round the basic notion of God beyond the seven circles acting upon an undivine world by supernatural eruptions. Aristotle and our Jewish inheritance are now burdens too grievous to be borne by the modern spirit. In days of distintegration and disillusionment there is a natural growth of superstition and a readiness to welcome with open arms any theology which will save its advocates the trouble of working out their own salvation with thought and courage. It is what McComb calls a 'desperado theology.' God for Barth is the Unknown, the great Incognito. In Barth's own words :

> 'The gospel comes to tell us that He is "wholly other" than man, so that there is no analogy between God's being and man's. The gospel proclaims a God utterly distinct from man. Salvation comes to them from Him because they are, as men, incapable of knowing Him, and because they have no right to claim anything from Him.'

Or, consider this amazing sentence :

> 'God is the unknown God, and precisely because He is unknown, He bestows life and truth and all things. Therefore the power of God can be detected neither in the world of Nature nor in the souls of men.'

How any revelation is possible between beings with no spiritual unity and who are essentially unlike, Barth, so far as I am aware, does not explain. Either the transcendent God is also immanent, or we are reduced to utter confusion. A more rational and religious world opens before us when we turn the pages of the books of Rufus M. Jones, and are told that

> 'we need to learn how to think of God as a resident Presence co-operating vitally with us and in us here and now as an Emmanuel God, and at the same time we need just as urgently to see how our human lives can and do open out into a Beyond within ourselves.'

The 'sky theory' of God is neither good enough nor true enough for those who realise that there is no 'up there' or 'down here,' and to go on using imagery which is absurd is to handicap the religion which is thus presented. Where there is no matter there is neither space nor time, hence, the spiritual is more than space-time reality. Personality, whether human or Divine, means self-realization in whole-i-ness of timeless realities, and we shall become God-like in proportion as we identify ourselves with His ends.

Difficult though it may be to understand, the divine makes itself manifest in the world of time. We may regard it as a process of incarnation, which was supremely manifest in Jesus, not as an isolated phenomenon, but as illustrative of that which is and is to be. In William James's words:

> 'May not you and I be confluent in a higher consciousness, and confluently active there though we know it not?'

The ape, the tiger and the donkey may lie behind us as we trace our pedigree, and they have an unhappy way of thrusting their faces into the present, but the important question is, what lies before us, to what goal are we stretching out? A spark disturbs our clod which glows with passionate devotion to what ought to be. Far indeed should be the days when men sought to commend religion by founding it on 'what science does not know.' New days bring new knowledge and a new awe. We may be less omniscient than our fathers were, but perhaps we are less artificial and more wholesome because of that. We find neither sense nor pleasure in looking for gaps which God may fill, or weak spots which suggest the need of Him. God is either in the whole or He is nowhere. As G. J. Blewett says:

> 'The true field of the principle of continuity is the total history in time, the total evolution of the universe. And so viewed, it is simply one way of apprehending the essential rationality of God and of the Divine action in Nature and in history.'

The sciences and religion touch reality at different points and in different ways, each seeking to understand, but not to be isolated from each other. Both are agreed that Mind is, in some way, of the essence of the process, and while the sciences as such are not concerned with this Mind in itself or with its purpose, religion is concerned with the data provided by the sciences,

and there is no other data. Professor Julian Huxley in his *Essays of a Biologist* has well stated that

> 'religion is the reaction between man as a personality and all of the universe with which he comes into contact. By his mental constitution he of necessity attempted to formulate some intelligible account of the constitution of the world and its relation to himself, and so we have a myth, a doctrine, or a creed.'

He then calls attention to the irreconcilable conflict between orthodox Christianity and orthodox natural science, which shows the quagmire into which the 'once for all' attitude lands itself. Those, however, who see God gradually revealing Himself at different levels from the inorganic to the organic, from the organic to the psychozoic, until in man, with his judgments of value, there appears the way of conscious co-operation in increasingly personal wholes, are open to no such criticism as that which Huxley rightly brings against orthodoxy. Values and appreciations have been and are as important in the evolution of man as the freeing of his hands from being organs of locomotion, and they are as natural. Without them we should not be persons at all, but things, and of one fact we can be quite sure, these values belong to the universe; they have emerged from it and belong to it, and neither the universe nor the Mind of which it is the expression can be understood apart from them. It is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of a better framework for moral upbuilding by developmental process than the one of which we have knowledge.

Nothing is in isolation, nothing could *be* at all without conformity to that mathematical order which we find everywhere. All our thinking is built upon the belief that we can trust the forms and categories of our human minds, that reason corresponds with Reason. The way to God is in the mind of man. We are thus led to the conclusion that in the religious attitude we have, in J. Y. Simpson's words,

> 'the most highly developed expression of that urge which drives man, in common with all other organisms, to come into completer and more harmonious relationship with his environment.'

Religion is, then, man's reaction to the world-process and its character as it impresses itself upon him. Slowly man has realized that his environment in its subtler, more ultimate aspect is spiritual, that it moves towards high ends. Man himself in

responsive adaptation to this environment finds himself lifted on to higher levels and becomes a partaker in life more abundant. Refusal to respond is sin, but worship fulfils itself in co-operation. We cannot separate ourselves from our physical basis, but, as we have seen, physical processes can give us no solution of mental and spiritual problems. At the same time we must beware of imagining that we are imposing something spiritual upon a universe essentially non-spiritual. We cannot too often repeat that the spiritual is not foreign to the natural, and any religion worthy of the name acts as a unifying power in which instincts, emotions, intellect and will find completion in mutuality within the personal whole. Such completion is not, of course, ever completely attained, but growth takes place in multiplying contacts and relationships. It may be put in a sentence :

> 'At every stage the mind that knows and interprets truth is embedded in and correlated with something more than itself. It is in co-operative response with objective reality of some sort.'

The late Sir J. A. Thomson, after answering in the affirmative the question, 'Is Nature congruent with religious interpretation?' comes back to his initial thesis, that religion is the growth of tendrils that reach towards a spiritual order of reality, and urges that

> 'religion is not merely a projection of the best that is in us, it is an opening of our hearts to the best that is outside of us.'

I was glad to find that he added that, while God's relation to His world must remain beyond man's comprehension, we must not think of something Divine that underpins the material universe and its psychical correlate. It seems inconceivable that the world should need any underpinning, else were there great imperfection in the creative institution of the order of nature.

> 'The irreducibles were quite able for the work that they had to do.'

Our theological thought must keep that fact in mind. To speak of God *or* Evolution is nonsense, and to say that men must choose between science and religion is mental gibberish which confesses its ignorance of both. You might as well say that a man must have either food to eat or air to breathe. It is but another example of that vicious dualism between the natural and the spiritual from which we have suffered so long. It is a denial

of the interpenetrativeness of all that is, a rending of our universe in twain. God is of the essential life of us, and, dare we say it? we are of the essential life of Him. We must be careful not to separate God from His world. Shall we not perhaps best conceive of Him in all His relationships as pre-eminently *the* Person of whom, as Lotze said, our personalities are but 'pale copies'? In glad co-operation with Him our sanest prayer becomes, 'Thy will be done.' 'The spirit of man is a candle of the Lord,' as Hebrew wisdom said, and the modern thinker does but echo the words when he exclaims:

> 'Human perfection is divine, perfect manhood is the manifestation of Godhood in the flesh.'

Had we but realized it, it was all spoken in those majestic words of the Fourth Gospel:

> 'In the beginning was the Logos (Divine Reason), and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God . . . All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that hath been made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men.'

LAWRENCE OF ARABIA*

> 'God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in a Son.'—Heb. i, 1.

MANY years ago for most of us, not so many for others, a child was born. At our birth our parents rejoiced, so did their friends, but the world did not; it was a local event and a commonplace. Such births happen with the frequency of a clock's tick.

Births may be commonplace, but what is born is not. The little bundle of flesh growing almost outrageously rapidly is a world force, a power for good or evil. Born of human parents and part of them, yet at the very moment of birth separated from them, it is in many respects alone in the world; it is a new centre of consciousness. Its life-struggle, the long process of adapting itself to circumstances and also of affecting and changing them, begins. It is the latest of the fifteen hundred million inhabitants

* A sermon preached in the Chapel of Jesus College, Oxford, on Sunday, May 26th, by Rev. L. B. Cross, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall.

of this globe, and in relation to them correspondingly insignificant; but it is their potential ideal. Fortunately the merciful Creator preserves the but feebly conscious infant from this terrifying thought.

Roughly, we may say, there are three great seas of life over which it must pass, that of infancy, that of adolescence, and that of manhood. In crossing the first the infant receives the help of many willing hands, sometimes too many and too willing, for it is still possible to spoil a child with kindness; across the second the adolescent is also helped by willing hands, but begins to learn the use and interpretation of the many charts compiled from the experience of past ages; across the third the man is left largely alone, his only constant guide being these charts of past experience. The more we voyage on, the more should we realize our debt to the past as well as our obligations to the present and to the future. The greatest mistake we could possibly make in steering our life's course is to think that when school and university days are done our education is complete; it has just begun, for at the best we have only learnt to use our charts. Our indebtedness to those who have gone before, and especially to those who have trod the Way of God, is incalculable. Not the written Word only but the history of the whole human race in the light of its relation to God should be our constant guide. Let me remind you of the words inscribed on the tombstone of the great English historian, J. R. Green, 'He died learning.'

Life is education and education is life. God is the Creator, He is also the Educator. Education is not the amassing of an encyclopaedic knowledge of all the so-called facts of learning, for a man may know everything but still be uneducated. Education is our reaction to God, men, and circumstances in the light of past experience, our own and that of men and nations.

And we must remember that our education has a purpose to fulfil, we cross the three seas of life with an objective in view. Those of you who are going to be teachers, whether of other people's children or of your own, need especially to be reminded that the mere handing on of knowledge without interpretation and without relating it to life is like presenting to a ship's captain a photograph of the sea instead of a chart. We must realize ourselves and make others realize too that we have each a con-

tribution to make to the sum total of life. God and man require of us something creative. We are not mere buckets in a dredger's endless chain picking up soil here and depositing it there; it is required of us that we produce something from the soil. So much of our modern education is a vicious circle. A boy taught by a man from the University goes up to the University to learn what to teach the next generation of boys, who will go up to the University to do the same thing, and so on *ad infinitum*. Or, to return to the analogy of the dredger, we train boys like buckets to pick up scraps of knowledge only to drop them when they leave school. Without the charts of past experience we cannot live in the present, and we should not dare to face the future.

Now it is how we can best develop the latent possibilities, the creative energies in us and in those with whom we have to deal that I want us to turn our thoughts to for a while. This is a matter which concerns us all, however old, or however young we may be.

Since the War forces have been at work which have tended to belittle the potentialities of the individual. The modern ideal appears to be the standard man. That this is so is painfully evident in the social experiments being conducted in Russia, Germany, Italy and America to-day. It is equally painfully evident in our own educational system, where the highest ideal in the majority of our schools is that a boy or girl should accumulate enough knowledge to pass some kind of Leaving Certificate examination. It is again equally painfully evident in our religious system, where we provide the same service, the same sermon, and give substantially the same teaching to individuals whose ages vary from nine to ninety, and whose intellectual and spiritual need and capacity are equally varied.

This tendency towards mass production in society, in education, and in religion, not only makes life dull, but it tends more than anything else to destroy potential creativeness, it kills genius. It divorces men from the past and from the future, and concentrates all their energies, too often expressed in the dull routine of mechanical duty, on the present, making the object of life the pursuit of safety, comfort, leisure and self. It is as though a man travelled thousands of miles enduring privation and suffering torture in pursuit of a Golden Fleece, and when

at length he finds it he discovers it is only a gilded mirror reflecting his own image. If a man has only himself to live for and lives only in the present, not planning creatively for the future or profiting creatively by the past, then his life is futile.

Jesus was the world's greatest creative genius. Let us turn to His life and see what its secret was. It was, I believe, simply this, that He understood life, the relation of past experience to present conduct and the importance of both in shaping the future. He drank deeply from the well of the Old Testament. He understood perhaps more than all others before Him how that God had 'of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners,' and He realized also that God was speaking through them to Him.

But Jesus' study of the past was no mere mechanical memorizing of the text of the Old Testament. It was a real study of it, He applied His mind and His whole self to it, He interpreted it in relation to His own life and to the circumstances of His own day. The result was that He was so markedly different from the religious leaders of His time, 'for He taught them as having authority, and not as their scribes.' He could say, 'It was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother is in danger of the judgment.' As the author of *I John* afterwards more dramatically expressed it, 'Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.' Jesus' study of the past did not convert Him to conventional prejudices of a social, political or religious kind; it made Him a creative genius.

But Jesus was not so absorbed in the past and in the present that He did not have regard to the future. It was the sovereignty of God's will on earth which mattered so tremendously to Him, the establishment of the Kingdom. He knew Himself how to live, and He teaches those who will study His life and catch His spirit how to live also. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself' was the keynote to His life. His thoughts were always God centred, God and His relations with man in the past, in the present and in the future.

The effect of this backward and forward look was dynamic among His contemporaries; He came, as He says, 'to cast fire upon the earth,' not to give peace. He was as it were a fire among the dry thorns of Judaism; He burnt it up, and out of the ashes which remained after the fire had passed over the little land of Palestine there came the still small voice of God which calls to us through Christ. Jesus was too big for the social system of His day, too big for the educational system, too big for the religious system; they crucified Him, He was not a standard man, He was not normal; to His contemporaries He was mad.

The babe who was born in Bethlehem became the greatest figure in the history of the world, not because He possessed a nature which was divine, but because He allowed His creative genius and the latent forces of His mind to develop through their contact with the past, the present and the future.

And now I want to draw your attention to another figure whose's life's work was done in Palestine, and which like the work of Jesus reached its climax and its most creative stage during a period of some three years, the man whom all the world knows as Lawrence of Arabia, the greatest genius who ever sojourned for a time within the walls of this College, and probably the greatest who ever will sojourn here.

It is not for me to tell of his exploits, they are too well-known for that to be necessary. Nor did his genius appear so much in what he did as in how he did it. He made history; he changed the face of the Near East. I do not wish to suggest that he was a second Jesus, or that he was as great as Jesus, but his life, if not consciously modelled on that life, has many striking parallels, and what is more important, has many lessons for us.

His twenty-six years of preparation for his life's work were lived in gaining experience. This he drew from history and biography. The article in the *Times* of Monday, May 20th, tells how from early days he became absorbed in the study of the past. The classics, archaeology, campaigns, old MSS., music, were to him meat and drink, not with a view only to his class in the Schools, but with a view to the understanding of life and obtaining complete harmony with it. From men too, men of all classes, he learnt the art of living. He says himself in his instructions to young officers, 'The beginning and the end of the

secret of handling the Arabs is unremitting study of them.' It was his familiarity with their past history, with their present circumstances, and with their future hopes, his making of himself a complete Arab, which placed him in a position of such complete confidence in relation to them as no other Englishman, with the possible exception of Doughty, has ever enjoyed. He became the uncrowned King of Arabia: certainly at the end of the War there were no honours or prizes of war which could not have been his, but he refused them all. He despised the pomps and vanities of this world. He asked nothing for himself.

Like our Lord also his mind dwelt on the future as well as on the past and present. The whole time that he was leading his Arabs he was not thinking only of the immediate issues of the War, and the particular sector of the world battle-line on which he was fighting. He was thinking of and planning for the future of that great Arab people who in the world not only of politics but also of science, literature, art and religion have in the past played such an important part in the evolution of culture. It was, I suppose, disappointment at the result of the final settlement after the War, and especially what he considered to be the treachery of the Allied Governments towards the Arabs, which made him retire from public life and seek refreshment in commonplace things.

This he did, as you all know, by enlisting, first in the Army, and then in the Air Force. This was an act, perhaps of self-discipline, certainly of an English gentleman. The man who, as I have said, could have had any honours and practically any position which he desired in the Army, in Government, or at the Universities, chose to become a private in the British Army. It was an act of self-abnegation, it was not cowardice, refusal to face up to the struggle. There in that work he found as much adventure, as much creative opportunity, as he had found in the desert. To be able to do that is true greatness.

Most of us, I suppose, would feel that we could be creative if only we were given unlimited money and unlimited power, but how many of us even think of being creative in the humbler walks of life? To be able to do this shows not only greatness, but humility, courage, and an amazing understanding of and adaptability to life in its varying moods. Like Paul, Lawrence

was capable of becoming all things to all men. To the Arab he became an Arab, to the Private a Private, to men a man. His belief was that a man should become one with other men, but one better than they, better by merit, not by holding vantage positions over them. The article in the *Times* says of him that he 'exercised command without being in command'; that is a rare art and one which amounts to genius in government, government made doubly difficult, for it entails governing those who govern. He scorned competition of any kind excepting competition in well doing: throughout his career he strove only to reach a standard raised in his own mind, not to outreach other men.

Of his courage, enterprise, scholarship, and, according to those who knew him, his personal charm, I will not speak; I will just leave those few thoughts with you. In shaping life draw your inspiration from the past, but live adventurously and courageously in the present. No man did this more than Lawrence; he was no mere antiquarian, nor was he an idle dreamer. Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. 'Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God . . . humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death.'

I cannot conclude with more fitting words than those of General Sir Ian Hamilton: 'Lawrence was one out of about fifty million. Now that saints are no more, the soldier who, absolutely selfless, risks everything for nothing tangible or material, raises thereby the whole level of human existence.'

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NATURE OF HISTORY*

The change in the Statutes regarding the Hulsean Lectures at Cambridge is bearing good fruit, since it has enabled the University to invite a wholly new type of lecturer. Mr. H. G. Wood is a layman, a Quaker, and a scientific historian, and he thus brings before us an apologetic of novel construction, and furnishes us with much fresh material, the nature of which is indicated in an interesting autobiographical preface. Six lectures then follow. The first of these is devoted to an examination of the nature of 'history,' and the claim of Christianity to provide profounder truth than the eastern religions by virtue of its association with history. The term itself is defined as implying a process of significant change. There are elements in it of repetition, but also of the individual, the irreversible, the non-repeatable (what Brunner has called once-for-all-ness). Mr. Wood stands with Trevelyan rather than with Bury in his conception of history,

* *Christianity and the Nature of History*. By H. G. Wood, being the Hulsean Lectures, 1933-1934. (Cambridge University Press. 1934. 6/- net.)

and quotes with approval Bertrand Russell's statement:

> 'Historical facts, many of them, have an intrinsic value, a profound interest on their own account, which makes them worthy of study, quite apart from any possibility of linking them together by means of causal laws.'

History, he concludes, is the outcome of those creative acts of individuals which make values available for mankind. The veracity of the Christian story, as Dr. Machen has insisted, was vital to the Christian Church, because without it the ideal values it proclaims are not certified to the common man as inherent in the very nature of things. 'Ideas must be actualised in events, embodied in persons . . . before they effectively shape human lives.'

The reviewer feels bound to ask at this point the question: *how much* in this case is regarded as actualised in the events of the career of Jesus? D. H. Lawrence and Middleton Murry are not Christ-myth cranks, and appear to accept just such a critical analysis of Mark as (say) Professor Burkitt would have given us. But their verdict is 'Jesus was a failure.' They do not feel that his Passion certifies certain ideal values as inherent in the very nature of things. It is only if we accept *the faith of the Church,* and refuse to let the story stop at the sealing of the rock-tomb, that we can say they are wrong. It seems then that in this case the historical events referred to by Mr. Wood must include the spiritual experiences of disciples, and not simply the earthly career of the Lord. Actually Mr. Wood takes the Cross as 'stopping the moral rot of the world' in the same way that Dr. Lindsay regards the death of Socrates as 'stopping the moral rot of Greece.' The question is does it? Without a dogmatic faith about the meaning and sequel of the passion, it may merely lead men to say, 'Anyhow, that sort of idealism doesn't pay.' Martyrdom for an ideal is always impressive, but it may convey more than one impression, and some may see in it only the tragedy of virtue shattering itself against the prison walls of an unfriendly universe. It is the faith proclaimed by the Church which is the decisive factor, the faith that the Cross was costly not simply to Jesus but also to God, Who, although afflicted in its affliction, was yet not defeated but victorious, not annihilated but successful in eluding the wiles of His enemies, because it was not possible that he should be holden of them. If that is history — and we suppose it is — it is history in a supernatural sense, and it would seem that only in that sense is Mr. Wood's thesis tenable. In other words, the events which actualise the ideas of the Gospel message are not simply events in what is commonly called 'the natural order,' though it may well be that the supernatural is the true natural, or that which takes in the *whole* of the natural.

The second lecture is devoted to a consideration of the relation of individual great men to the social forces in the course of events, and here the lecturer pays tribute to the contribution of the community to the development of the Christian faith. He quotes with approval 'Jesus might have died in vain if He had not persuaded other men to die with Him and for Him.' The achievement of Jesus is indeed bound up with the faith of the Christian community, but in a greater sense than this. We might say 'Jesus would have died in vain if He had not persuaded other men that He was not just any good man but *The* Man, "Daniel's man" if you like.' Part of this lecture is devoted to an examination of the theories of Kautsky, which have not hitherto received much attention in this country, but which need refutation. Mr. Wood deals faithfully with these, and in true Cambridge style cuts away the ground from under them by pointing out that they are based upon the assumption of the priority of Luke to the other Gospels, an uncritical pre-supposition which certainly discredits the judg-

ment of their inventor. There can be no doubt that as far as scientific history is concerned Troeltsch is correct in saying that Christianity arose as a lower-middle class religious movement, and the notion of its being a social revolution of the *Lumpenproletariat* is merely an ill-conceived romance.

The third lecture is concerned with the idea of the guiding hand of God in history, which really means 'the guiding hand of God as manifest in the career of Jesus,' who as Dr. C. G. Montefiore has said, 'took the treasures of Israel and made them available for mankind,' for a world dying, as its contemporary literature shows, for lack of certain knowledge of God and social morality. Mr. Wood draws attention to Klausner's complaint against Jesus that he ignored the requirements of the national life, and set up only a certain conception of God and morality acceptable to *all* mankind, a conception which therefore does not belong to any special nation. This, says Klausner, was the chief reason why His own people Israel rejected Him. It is significant that Klausner's complaint is precisely that of some German neo-pagan nationalists to-day. They want a national and not an international faith, and they are rejecting the religion they need for the religion they want. 'A religion which possesses only a certain conception of God and a morality acceptable to all mankind' was certainly what the ancient world needed, and what the modern closely-knit world needs. It is to the credit of the ancient world that it recognised its need and accepted its satisfaction. The modern world, especially in Germany, and to some degree still in this country, seems petulantly to prefer disintegration and disaster rather than submit its essential needs to satisfaction by the easy yoke of Christ. So much the worse for it.

Lecture four is a continuation of the previous theme of Chapter 3, and deals with the prophetic interpretation of history. This is mainly a discussion of Mr. Butterfield's criticism of the 'Whig interpretation' of historical data. Mr. Wood agrees with him in his contention (1) that a great and significant personality need not necessarily be great by some purely moral standard, though such greatness is certainly the historian's chief concern, and (2) that it is the function of the historian to act not as judge but as expert witness, and to tell us what happened without fear or favour. But he disagrees with Mr. Butterfield's further conclusions, holding him to be inconsistent in his statements, and really quite as ready to commit himself to value-judgments as any of the besotted partisan historians whom he dubs Whigs. The gist of it all is, according to Mr. Wood, that there is, as Lord Acton always maintained, a legitimate prophetic interpretation of history, which recognises that only righteousness exalteth a nation, and that the just can live only by faith. This, he urges, can only be seen if we rely on long-range and not short-range historical judgments, and he thinks that it is the latter which have been responsible for the denial by (for example) Lord Morley, that there is such a thing as ethical justice in the shaping of the course of events. The mills of God grind slowly. It sometimes takes a century or so to discover that they grind small.

Lecture five reviews Christianity in relation to progress. The subject has been discussed in recent times by Dr. Inge, and perhaps it may be felt that there is not much in this chapter which has not been said before, except the criticism of Mr. Gerald Heard's *Ascent of Humanity,* which is typical of the modern humanist outlook, and had not appeared when the famous Romanes lecture was written. But Mr. Wood differs, I think, from Dean Inge, in seeking to re-define progress, and then to retain it. Would he not have estimated Mr. Heard's position better if he had included in his survey the latter's *Social Substance of Religion,* in which there is a more definite reference to Christ?

The concluding lecture is entitled 'The Religion of Time and the Religion of Eternity,' and reverts to the same topic as that dealt with by Professor A. E. Taylor in his final Gifford Lecture on 'The Ultimate Tension.' The substance of Mr. Wood's conclusions may here be summed up in two of his quotations: '*that* religion will conquer which can render clear to popular understanding some eternal greatness incarnate in the passage of temporal fact' (A. N. Whitehead) and 'we think God is like that for ever, because it happened once, with Christ' (Helen Waddell.). Granted. But here we come back to the very point discussed in the review of chapter one. How does Christianity 'render clear' that God is revealed in Christ? Not by the complete scientific demonstration of the historian as expert witness, unless that witness include the faith and works and spiritual experiences of the Christian Church and its saints. There is in fact no complete demonstration of 'the excellence of revealed religion' available to the reason of the natural man. But 'he that hath the Son hath the witness in himself.' The passage of temporal fact must include for religion events which are not demonstrable by pointer-readings, but which are 'spiritually discerned.'

A. C. Bouquet.

A NEW APPROACH TO AN OLD PROBLEM*

Dr. Spencer's new book is not intended 'to furnish a proof of survival or of immortality by direct argument, but to set forth the Christian view of the after-life in a form that will prove itself.' The author holds that this Christian view 'because of its intrinsic beauty and truth will attract attention and gradually convince through its harmony with the nature of human personality and the facts of experience.'

In his opening chapter Dr. Spencer deals with those beliefs in an after-life which, diverse in character, are found in the Old Testament. He traces the processes of change which led from primitive spiritism and necromancy to the assurance of a heavenly life for the righteous individual after death, and finally to the apocalyptic belief in the collective bodily reanimation of the elect. Of the famous passage from Job (19: 19*f*) Dr. Spencer remarks:

> 'It is not immortality of which the hope is here expressed, but a brief vision after death, when he should be out of the flesh (not "in my flesh"), of the vindication by God that he was far better morally than his misfortunes had led his friends and neighbours to suppose.'

The process of change here traced is by no means a steady development from lower to higher. The highest point is touched in Psalm lxxiii, where belief in a future life is the direct outcome of religious experience:—

> 'Certain pious souls became so vividly aware in their worship of the loving presence of God, that they had the conviction that God would sustain them through death and bring them into closer intimacy with Himself. Whatever happened to others, they knew intuitively that the love of God would keep them safe and make them blessed.'

As for the subsequent belief in a resurrection, this 'represents the patriotic form of belief in a future life.' For the Jew, with his patriotism fired by his religion, 'could be content with no expectation of personal survival that did not reunite him with his nation to participate in its future glory.' Dr. Spencer holds that such a belief as this may still contain values of importance.

> 'To those who, caring little for merely national progress, toil with

* *The Future Life.* By Dr. F. A. M. Spencer. (Hamish Hamilton. 1935. 7/6.)

straining effort and continuing patience, and yearn with aching longing and consoling reverie, for a humanity perfect and entire in all human excellencies, does the faith of the resurrection make its appeal.'

Dr. Spencer takes the view that in rejecting this current doctrine of resurrection the Sadducees did not deny immortality. They were 'traditionally the party of tolerance towards the Gentile world and so may well have entertained Hellenistic views concerning the soul.'

With regard to the teaching of Jesus upon the 'last things,' Dr. Spencer adopts a conservative standpoint. The choice by Jesus of *Isaiah* lxi in his Nazareth sermon as prophetic of his own mission seems to Dr. Spencer highly 'inconsistent with a near expectation of the Second Advent, understood as involving the end of the natural order of the world.' He, in fact, here offers to the Jews 'blessings which imply its continuance.' Perhaps the best solution is that of the late Professor B. W. Bacon, who, in his *Studies in Matthew,* regards Jesus as expectant of an immediate coming of the Kingdom of God, but a Kingdom of a kind foretold by the *prophets*, e.g. in *Isaiah* lxi, and not by the apocalyptic visionaries. As for a 'second' coming, it is hard to understand how Jesus himself at this stage could have been expecting any such thing. What he looked for was a speedy first coming of the 'Son of Man.' Dr. Spencer also holds that when Jesus promised that those who had remained faithful to him in his trials should 'sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel,' the promise may be taken 'as an example of the vein of gentle and sometimes melancholy humour, tending to irony, characteristic of Jesus.' It may seem so to Dr. Spencer, but it is very doubtful if the promise was taken in that light by the disciples. That it could not have been meant seriously by Jesus seems, frankly, incredible. It was, we believe, Dr. Glover who, in his *Jesus of History,* first introduced this now rather popular idea of Jesus' delicate vein of humour; but this is only one instance of the unhistorical character of the portrait there portrayed. Surely the promise is definitely to be associated with Psalm cxxii, 5, and with the early verses of Psalm lxxii. The 'thrones of Judgment' referred to are those of the Davidic ruler of that Kingdom foretold by the prophets. The promise is Messianic: those who shared the tribulations of the Son of Man should also share his glory. Jesus was speaking with the most solemn earnestness.

Dr. Spencer traces in some detail the development of Paul's view on the resurrection, but holds that the traditional belief in a bodily and collective resurrection was never abandoned by him.

> 'He pictured in imagination the Body of Christ building itself up in love. He foretold the dethronement of the principalities and powers in heavenly places, that had wrought so much havoc in human affairs. He was assured that the (lower) creation itself would be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. He knew that at long last death, man's most powerful foe, would be laid low and brought to nought. Thus would humanity, along with its physical environment, be transformed by God and lifted up into the spirituality and glory that before the ages He had purposed and decreed.'

Very interesting is Dr. Spencer's examination of the views of Scotus Erigena, the Irish genius of the ninth century, to 'the greatness and originality' of whose thought a deserved tribute is paid. Erigena looked for the eventual 'restoration of all things,' when 'Nature itself and its causes shall pass into God, as air passes into light.'

'His comparison of the final consummation to air passing into light, though it strikes us as unscientific, is really a beautiful illustration. Erigena was evidently thinking of a day of radiant sunshine, when the very atmosphere appears composed of light, though it ceases not to be air.'

Dr. Spencer, in an interesting chapter on Psychic Communications, considers that 'the description of the state after death afforded by spiritism at its best is not unacceptable either from a philosophical or from a Christian standpoint.' In a chapter on the Doctrine of Metempsychosis, Dr. Spencer discusses the views of Origen:—

'I have the impression that Origen was attracted to the theory of metempsychosis, that not improbably he at one time tentatively entertained it, but that, without denouncing it as heretical, he felt it to be inconsistent with the general tenor of the eschatology of the New Testament. We may wonder whether the displacement of catastrophic by evolutionary conceptions of the world-process would have inclined him to modify his judgment.'

In a further chapter the views on this question of such philosophers as James Ward and Ellis McTaggart are also discussed. Dr. Spencer is evidently sympathetically disposed towards this idea of the transmigration of souls. After all, pre-existence is no more difficult to imagine than survival; in fact, it may seem more logical to believe in both than to believe only in one. Dr. Spencer essays to unite this belief with the traditional Christian belief in a collective resurrection, using the doctrine of evolution to effect the fusion. Can the hypothesis of reincarnation be used 'to bring the belief in a general resurrection into relation to the long evolution of man?'

'For the belief in a general resurrection asserts collectivity and coporeality—or, more simply, fellowship and the body—in man's attainment of complete immortality; and the hypothesis of metempsychosis attempts to link the present imperfect fellowship and bodily existence in mortality, by the supposition of a continuous process of development, with the future perfect fellowship and body of immortality for which the doctrine of the resurrection stands.'

Dr. Spencer has written an interesting book on a subject of immense importance. He has not been afraid to speculate boldly, and the later chapters of his work are for this reason specially stimulating.

J. C. Hardwick.

WHY BELIEVE?

In his little book on the *rationale* of the Faith which is expressed in the Apostles' Creed, Dr. Hunkin, then Archdeacon of Coventry and now Bishop of Truro, examines the character and grounds of that Faith. Regarding the use of Reason as the privilege and duty of every man, he deprecates the present-day tendency to make light of Reason.

'There can be no doubt that man should use his Reason and that the use of it brings light and fresh air into his life. Reason saves him from the gloom and stuffiness of fanaticism and intolerance and superstition. But further, Reason is a faculty which each individual must use for himself. No one else can do his thinking for him. Others, no

* *Is it Reasonable to Believe?* By J. W. Hunkin, D.D., M.C. (Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd. 1935. Price 3/-.)

> doubt, can help, but every man must think for himself, or else his life will be maimed and unbalanced and his personality on one side undeveloped and atrophied.'

'Every man,' says Dr. Hunkin, 'must in the long run be his own philosopher,' and in his book he aims at providing his readers with the kind of mental and spiritual stimulus which will encourage them to think out things for themselves.

Though it is true that, however little explicit his philosophy may be, every man is his own philosopher, it is no less true that his philosophy may be, and often is, crude and shallow. The influence of the pseudo-philosophy which percolates through the popular novel and through articles in the press is widely pervasive. It is safe to say that most laymen are not even aware of the solid value of the work which is being done by our great thinkers, and have not so much as heard of such books as Tennant's *Philosophical Theology,* published in 1930, and Oman's *The Natural and the Supernatural,* published in the following year, books to which Dr. Hunkin repeatedly acknowledges his indebtedness. Even if the layman happens to have heard of them, he usually is not possessed of the mental training which would enable him to read them with profit. Even the disciplined student, though he would readily admit that his labour is richly rewarded, probably finds parts of Dr. Tennant's book heavy going. But it is nevertheless of primary importance at the present time that the thought of such great religious thinkers should be brought within the ken of the man who has had no special philosophical training. This can only be done by one who moves freely in the world of philosophical thought and at the same time has the gift of clear and popular exposition. Dr. Hunkin possesses pre-eminently this double qualification. It is this which gives his book its special value.

Dr. Hunkin is also a historian, and his book should lead the intelligent reader to the study of the writings of such great historical scholars as the late Professor Burkitt. In agreement with Burkitt, as against the more radical exponents of Form Criticism, Dr. Hunkin assigns a high historical value to St. Mark's Gospel and holds that, though the Synoptic Gospels cannot claim the accuracy of shorthand reports, they do give an authentic picture of the historic Jesus.

> 'Not long ago I was comparing notes with a friend as to our experiences during the War. We both agreed that we had forgotten a great many things that, at the time, we thought we never should forget; yet some people stood out clearly in our memories. Without our being able to quote exactly anything they had said, enough of their personalities remained with us for us still to know vividly and without doubt what kind of men they were and what they stood for; what sort of things they approved of and disapproved of. So within the small compass of the Gospels the character of Christ shines forth clearly and unmistakably. We see plainly his attitude to God and to the business of life. We know the direction in which he would have the world move forward.'

It is not possible to give a summary of the argument which Dr. Hunkin develops which would do it justice. As he himself says in his concluding chapter, the arguments are themselves little more than summaries and hardly permit of further compression. Compression, however, has not resulted in dryness or obscurity. Dr. Hunkin has the knowledge and skill to select the essential points, to place them in a right perspective, and to illuminate them

by the use of illustrations which are fresh and apposite. About a third of his book is devoted to the grounds of belief in God. Then he goes on to expound the revelation of God in history, a revelation which finds its meaning and climax in the Incarnation and expresses itself dynamically through the action of the Holy Spirit. But religion is not to be identified with theological correctitude.

> 'Here we come to something of more practical importance than the attempt to define the person of Jesus. Do we, or do we not, recognise his claims upon us? That is the question. He has left us no precise rules, but the one great principle of Love: Love to God and man. Are we prepared to adopt his attitude to life's business? . . . What really matters is no verbal definition or confession, but something much deeper—personal allegiance and loyalty.'

The Church provides the social environment which is necessary for the life and development of the individual. 'It is in active co-operation with the organised life of the Christian society that Christians become receptive to the influence of the Holy Spirit and realise their true selves.' The ideal of catholicity is nothing less than the inclusion within the Church of all people 'whose lives are being redeemed from selfishness and fear, whose characters are being strengthened and purified through communion with God.' The unity of such a Church does not necessitate uniformity of order.

> 'There is no reason in the nature of things why Church Order should always and everywhere be identically the same. In the past there have sometimes been most unfortunate attempts to enforce uniformity. Such attempts are inevitably destructive of real unity.'

Nor must faith be shackled by rigidly interpreted dogmatic formulae.

> 'Truth has many facets, and no individual is likely to do justice to them all, but he must not be shut out of the fellowship on that account. The interpretation of the clauses of the Creed has varied in the past and will no doubt vary in the future.'

And again:—

> 'Nothing is more certain than that if we unduly narrow the circle of permitted belief we break the fellowship; we make it absolutely impossible for the Church to be in any real sense catholic.'

In discussing the doctrine of Forgiveness, Dr. Hunkin points out the difficulty of using to-day the sacrificial language which came naturally enough to Jews, who had long looked upon animal sacrifice as a method of propitiating God. 'The word "satisfaction" especially will not do.' The heart of the doctrine of forgiveness and redemption is the doctrine of Love.

> 'Our Lord enunciated the great principle of LOVE. Love to God and man—one Love which is to be the guiding principle of all our life and conduct. In his life he gave us a demonstration of the principle and lit the flame of enthusiasm for it in the hearts of a few disciples. It is a thing caught rather than taught. It has been passed down the generations along a line of living torches to us. Humanitarianism is not enough: it will not, in the long run, stand the strain. The Love of God, satisfying, transfiguring, adding new quality and steadfastness to our love to men, will alone keep us fresh and undeterred by rebuff and discouragement and disappointment.'

Believing that positive Christianity is firmly grounded, Dr. Hunkin is an optimist and looks forward with confidence to the fulfilment of its mission by a truly Catholic Church.

> 'The leaders of the world's thought to-day are asking for a new religion. But no one can artificially and at will manufacture a new religion, and it is certainly not the business of these scientific and political leaders to make any such attempt. A new religion should properly grow out of an old: it should be a new branch on a living trunk. The Christian Church is a tree which is certainly alive. It needs pruning, rather drastic pruning. That must be admitted, and its official custodians must beware of being obstructionists. Some parts of it are more capable of sprouting and new growth than others. Dogmatic rigidity and excessive ceremonial seem to me to be at present in some Communions an almost insuperable bar to healthy progress. But loyal membership of a still reforming Christian Church is the great hope for the future.'

We believe that Dr. Hunkin's book will be of great service. It should provide an intellectual stimulus and a spiritual tonic for the clergy—and they are many—who are working under conditions conducive to lethargy of mind and spirit. It will be invaluable to the puzzled layman. The list of books for further study appended to each chapter provides an admirable guide for the enquirer. Every page bears the mark of candour and sincerity and nowhere is there any trace of the plausible and skilful argumentation, the merely verbal dexterity which some theologians are driven to use in order to conceal the existence of really disparate elements within their system of thought.

G. L. H. Harvey.

A PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN HIGHER CRITIC*

There were higher critics in the primitive Christian Church, but they were few and far between. Origen, the greatest Christian scholar of the third century, was interested mainly in the lower textual criticism of the Bible and its interpretation. He concerned himself with higher criticism very little. Yet he was sufficiently a higher critic to recognize that the style of the *Epistle to the Hebrews,* not its doctrine, forbade St. Paul being regarded as its author.

Dionysius, Patriarch of Alexandria, and at one time head of its famous Catechetical School, and a pupil of Origen, has left behind him a very remarkable letter on the style of the *Apocalypse of St. John* which shows him to have been a higher critic of no mean ability.

Julius Africanus, a layman, probably an ex-soldier, an inhabitant of Emmaus, was also a primitive higher critic and crossed swords successfully with the great Origen. Origen had assumed in discussion that *The Story of Susanna* was a part of the original *Book of Daniel.* Julius Africanus proved that it was not only no part of the original *Daniel,* but a Greek insertion into it. He also showed that the events narrated could not possibly be historical. The letter to Origen in which his argument occurs is happily still extant, and has been translated and annotated by Mr. E. H. Blakeney, M.A. This appeared originally as an article in *Theology,* September, 1934, but we are glad to see that it has recently been republished in pamphlet form by its author.

It is a matter for deep regret that so many of the writings of Julius

* *Julius Africanus, a Letter to Origen.* Greek text, edited with Introduction, Translation and Notes. By E. H. Blakeney, M.A. (Privately Printed, 1935.)

Africanus have perished, for if their quality generally was equal in acumen and interest to his letter to Origen, they must have contained much for which students of Christian antiquity would be grateful to-day.

Mr. Blakeney's elucidatory notes are scholarly and succinct.

H.D.A.M.

A COMMENTARY ON *ACTS**

It would be quite impossible to put into the hands of the ordinary New Testament student the five large volumes of Lake and Foakes-Jackson, yet it has not been at all easy to find a smaller book about *Acts* which combines sound modern scholarship with sufficient simplicity, or indeed a small sound book at all; but the little book of Mr. Findlay solves the problem. It is a first-class small commentary on the *Acts of the Apostles*.

The notice on the dust-cover states that the aim of the author is to provide a text-book for schools; but while it will admirably serve such a purpose, used by a teacher as a class book, without immodesty it might well have commended itself to the theological colleges also.

The printing of the full English text (Revised Version) is a sound judgment. This not only provides the best means of showing the student the particular sections which may be examined as a unity — homogeneous sections so admirably disguised by the normal chapter arrangement — but also it is an assurance that the student has the text to hand. However laudable may be the intention in printing commentaries without the text so that the student may 'read with his Bible open,' the fact is that he does not, and relies rather upon his memory, which, at least as far as the text of the New Testament is concerned, is somewhat unreliable.

It may perhaps be that the author spread himself a little too freely in the early chapters of the commentary so that he was forced to abbreviate rather fiercely as he reached the p. 200 mark; yet an amazing amount of sound matter is packed attractively into just over two hundred pages of print. He was not frightened by lack of space, so that plain statement is enlivened with many pleasant and interesting asides to encourage the reader to further study in the Rabbinic and Hellenistic foundation of Christianity. The little aside on p. 117,

> '. . . we speak of the "Life of Christ" when we mean the "Life of Jesus" quite incorrectly,'

indicates not only the author's wisdom but his knowledge of 'his public' also.

The little homiletic turns are good: they add much to the interest, and, without sermonising heavily, relate the New Testament to the life of this century, yet the increase of these touches in the section about miracle (p. 135) arouses the suspicion that the author is not really happy here. Perhaps this 'unhappiness,' which is revealed wherever miracle occurs in the book, is the result of trying to make the best of both possible worlds, the Old and the New. In any case Mr. Findlay's problem,

> 'how and why these strange things happened I cannot tell, and I do not feel bound to accept our author's interpretation of their meaning,'

is not the problem for most of us. The interpretation that God was at work in the world — thus to account for the events, whatever they were, seems sane enough. It is the events themselves as recorded that trouble us.

While we are disagreeing it might be added that the 'Western' text is at least tentatively given an authority that most New Testament scholars would hesitate to accept. Then, too, Mr. Findlay's estimate of Luke as a historian suffers somewhat from a 'little too much' being said. We cannot

* *The Acts of the Apostles.* By A. C. Findlay. (S.C.M. Press. 1935. 2/6.)

at the same time argue that Luke, the ancient as opposed to the modern historian, 'sticks to his sources' (p. 8), yet let him 'write freely' (p. 105).

But this is carping. It is a fine little book complete with excellent maps and a plan.

J. R. C. Webb.

THE CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS IN MODERN GERMANY*

Those who would learn further of both the religious and the political situation in modern Germany could not do better than read these two books. Dr. Keller's is a sequel to his *Karl Barth and Christian Unity,* reviewed in these pages in March of this year. It was first delivered as the L. P. Stone Lectures at Princeton in 1933, and, we would make bold to say, it is a great improvement upon the earlier book, its style lucid and its logic easily to be followed. Professor Piper's book was also written as lectures, delivered in Manchester University. Of Professor Piper Mr. H. G. Wood says in a foreword:

> '(He) is peculiarly fitted to interpret the religious thought of Germany to English readers. . . Along with his folk he has passed through the tragic experiences of the war and after. He has laboured in the cause of goodwill. . . He was a member of the Faith and Order Conference at Lausanne in 1927. When Hitler came into power, Dr. Piper was dismissed from his chair . . .'

Both books proceed in much the same way and say much the same thing. An historical retrospect of German religious life since the Reformation is followed by an analysis of the present turmoil which leads, in conclusion, to the affirmation of a New Theology by Prof. Piper, of Neo-Lutheranism, or, nearly indifferently, of Neo-Calvinism, by Dr. Keller. The method adds greatly to the value of these books for the student. Both books, in effect, posit Lutheranism and regard Liberal Protestantism as a departure from that Reformer's gospel. Both authors look upon the War as the crucible which melted away the older forms of Protestantism and from which has flared the fiery tongue of the Barthian Word. Both, again, draw inspiration from Barth, but in them Barth has taken body, mind and will, as a religious spirit must when animating men who will not abandon their world even though, like Prof. Piper, they must fight it.

Dr. Keller sees the heart of the religious conflict in modern Germany to be the opposition of Lutheranism to Calvinism. The one is monarchial, popular and prophetic; the other democratic, scientific and intellectualist. A dozen serious battles are in progress on the flanks; between racialism and self-assertion, with Rosenberg for prophet, and the universalism of Christian love; between Catholicism and Protestantism; between Humanism, science, historical criticism, and a Biblical religion precious in evangelical grace; between the claims of the self-sufficient State and the redeeming Church; between hard-pressed politicians and individual theologians and Church administrators: but the main engagement is still the old one, 'of which the Colloquy of Marburg, in the year 1529, was only the beginning.'

> '. . . On the one hand there is a Church group which demands a powerful episcopal Church government, limitation of the rights of the congregation and of the synod, and a close connection and friendship with the State; on the other hand there is a small Reformed minority

* *Religion and the European Mind.* By Adolf Keller, D.D., LL.D. (Lutterworth Press. 1934. Price 6/-.)

Recent Developments in German Protestantism. By Dr. Otto Piper, D.D. (S.C.M. Press. 1934. Price 4/-.)

standing for a democratic Church organization and for the universal priesthood of believers over against the authority of the bishop.'

Professor Piper is not so fond as Dr. Keller of that, to our mind, false Tübingen adaptation of Hegelian dialectic to history which leaves Dr. Keller if not satisfied then exhausted to discover Lutheran thesis and Calvinist antithesis eternally determining the religious affairs of men. For Prof. Piper, Germany's religious ills plainly follow from the corruption of Luther's teaching. Dr. Keller, indeed, advocates true Lutheranism, 'grace alone' and an ethic based only on apprehension of God's judgment and justification by faith. But Prof. Piper's whole book amounts to an analysis of the departure from Luther together with an account of the rediscovery of Luther by post-war German theologians. The corruption has been threefold. The Faith has been falsified by Quietism, Individualism and subjectivism. The Faith has been betrayed by Humanists, of whom Melancthon is named the first, and defended against Catholicism by men 'who succumbed to the temptation of a rational theology' and answered Schoolmen by their own logical methods.

'Will Protestantism be replaced by Catholicism and modern science?' Lastly, the Faith has been socially perverted, ever since Luther's inaction in the Peasants' War, and become the religion of intellectual people dealing with 'the problems of the bourgeois middle class.' The War pricked these corruptions and now there is new growth of pure Lutheranism. The central doctrines of God's transcendence and man's dependence Prof. Piper vigorously restates, with illuminating references to contemporary German theology and politics. In his further exposition two features are particularly remarkable. There is a new acknowledgment of the claims of the Church as against the older Protestant individualism.

> 'The New Realists see that in Protestant theology the super-individual *nature of man* has been usually neglected.
>
> 'The New Theology suddenly discovered that God does not deal with man through private inspirations. Though God's will is directed personally to every Christian, He works it out through the activity of the Church.
>
> 'Moreover, we have found the way to God, not by our own endeavours, but by the fact that God has led us to Him by the religious teaching of our denomination.'

Secondly, there follows from this a new understanding of Luther's conception of authority.

> 'Luther had three great theological authorities: the Bible, the religious experiences of the Church, and his own experience. . . Only in an indissoluble connection can they be authorities, not one without the others.'

On the main question underlying these books, the relation of Church and State, the authors are not convincing. They will leave the average Englishman with an increased regard for them as men but also with a newly-awakened sympathy for the National-Socialist and the German Christian. Paradoxically, these German theologians seem to us unable to state a single, articulated ideal for German State and Christian Church just because they are so German. Not only are there the customary exclusive use of German authorities on all subjects and the typical acute self-absorption with Luther's 'beloved Germans,' and with German ideas, but for these authors Luther, 'the greatest of Germans,' is Gospel and Epistle, and the Reformation is Pentecost. The reference is never to the Fathers, to St. Paul, or to Jesus, but always to Luther. For Dr. Keller he is a

'divinely endowed personality.' Prof. Piper in the same breath can claim Christianity itself for Luther and yet declare his theology to be peculiarly German because meet for the German characteristics of fatalism and pessimism. The subtlest theological writhings of the writers never fetch them beyond a German standpoint, and in the result they have no supra-national vantage from which to check and inspire both themselves and the German people. The Christian who would save his nationality must lose it. Secondly, there is no attempt to come to terms with philosophy, history or science. It is not enough, though popular to-day, to name the attempt Liberalism and to pretend it is dead. The findings in these fields remain inconveniently and incontrovertibly right and in daily use by theologians themselves. Prof. Piper's rehabilitation of traditional views seems sometimes evasive and altogether too easy. 'Pneumatical Exegesis' of Scripture cannot be separated from the more humdrum scholarly methods by a bulkhead of evangelical enthusiasm, and we are not much persuaded of the Fall of Man by the argument that:

> 'Human nature is obviously to be considered as a shape which imposes itself upon every individual of the species. Therefore Adam's sin can be our sin, for Adam is not only an individual. The first man, wherever and whenever he lived, transmitted his shape and his nature to all men.'

Prof. Piper escapes many of the difficulties of history by asserting the reality and power of Satan. Satan falsified Luther's work and seduced the older Protestants into Liberalism. He is certainly handy when the issue is the capitulation of Luther to the bourgeoisie on the Peasants' War.

These theologians, despite their real desire, are not at one with their nation before God. They have seen beyond the individual to the Protestant Church, but the frontiers of that elect body are for them the horizons of God's mercy. Thus they personify the nation as the State and are much concerned with Home Missions to convert it. It is because the New German Theology will not recognize the voice of God save in Lutheran caves selected by itself.

> 'A man can be an honest and loyal citizen, leading a blameless moral life, yet God does not recognize any distinction between him and a criminal' (Prof. Piper).

Can God do anything and not inform His servants the prophets? Undoubtedly He can and does. Philosophers, artists, scientists, politicians, these are to be heard and weighed in their own right, for the power of God in them. These theologians and their kind, in and out of Germany, seem to have almost a professional view of Grace and to be jealous for their practice of it. Leaving aside the present exceptional circumstances in Germany, these writers fail fundamentally to comprehend the State in their religious thinking because they do not recognize that the inspiration of the men who constitute the State may have the same validity as their own. Here is nothing of that joyous, daring faith which inspired a second-century Apologist, though in face of the overwhelming pagan Empire, to declare that the Christian was to the world as the soul to the body. Ultimately, as these authors would agree, it is a matter of doctrine. For any men, as a Church or not, to imagine they know and alone have access to all the channels of God's grace and revelation is a piece of human impertinence of the very sort which Barth and these authors so loudly condemn, the erection of man's understanding of God against God's own inscrutable way.

There is an influential section of the Church of England which sees in the struggle of the German Church an example for their own Church.

These books reveal it as an awful example. That same section is rapidly bringing to pass in England the conditions which obtain in Germany. They would have Christianity a cult, its doctrines and its morals narrower and more binding than the New Testament and its continuing Spirit, as the Unitarian decision and much of the recent Divorce discussions testify. The Church of the cult is to crystallize over against the nation and be free of the 'State'—a conception which will then have definition in this country for the first time in its history. Christianity will be one thing, jealously treasured by its priests, and the power of the Spirit in the daily walks of life another. The tragedy is not primarily that when the Church goes into the desert of her own imaginings the course of the Word, wrenched discarnate, runs dry, and that the Word may only burst forth in Barthian hot-springs to lose itself again; such a Church can be but a small group of persons. The tragedy lies here, that where the Church has thus abandoned her call, the whole people of a nation, left comfortless and guideless, in their native faith and aspiration seek after worship and religious expression in superstitious barbarities and uncouth myth, in fantasies such as haunt Germany to-day, where Krist now leads his beloved Aryans.

M.T.D.

COBBETT DE NOS JOURS*

Those who a few years ago placed Sir Arnold Wilson's *Loyalties* in their libraries, should hasten to add his *Walks and Talks* to their bedside bookshelf. It is an intimate and leisurely book, combining the tempered ingenuousness of W. H. Hudson's prose, with a detailed painting in of England's 'field full o' folk,' which is neither exactly that of Langland, Crabbe, nor Cobbett, but contains interesting reminiscences of all three.

The circumstances in which the book came to be written might be noted with profit by all actual and potential M.P.'s. Sir Arnold, finding himself duly elected to Westminster by the good people of the Hitchen Division of Hertfordshire, realized that he knew little if anything either of those who had given him their confidence, or of their manner of life. But instead of reclining in his safe seat and sending them the type of occasional message whose only merit is that it means less than nothing, he determined to see and to know his people, and, like some old-time parson appointed to a far-flung parish, set out to tramp the length and breadth of his constituency. What he discovered and what he learnt during this itinerary are duly recorded in this book. The squire, the parson, the farm labourer and the suburban artizan, are all allowed their say and encouraged in their confidences. The green lane which ends at the public-house and the arterial road which sweeps past rapidly-developing factory sites alike lead this very human and very earnest M.P. to where his people labour and loiter. His arrival is appreciated, all the more because it is casual and unexpected, and a hundred and one social matters and domestic intimacies are opened up and discussed over tankard or tea-cup. There is a welcome absence of politics, in the narrow sense of the word, and it is pleasing to find a man who feels that those who did not give him their votes have nevertheless as much claim on him as those who did.

The rapid mechanization of life for all classes of people to-day, and in particular its inevitable disintegration of village life, naturally occupy a large portion of the book. Family limitation, the 'dormitory' existence of those who journey daily to their work in London, the cinema, wireless, and motor-'bus, have so altered the lives of those who were once rooted in the

* *Walks and Talks.* The Diary of a Member of Parliament in 1933-34. By Sir Arnold Wilson, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.M.G., D.S.O. (London: Oxford University Press; Humphrey Milford. 1934. 5/-.)

English countryside, that there is a danger of a large part of our population losing all touch with the soul-ennobling ties of local interest and habitation. It is precisely for this reason that we find ourselves in disagreement with Sir Arnold when he criticizes the already much-maligned, and seemingly ill-fated Hadow Report. In the face of present-day circumstances no past system of education can hope to remain unaltered, and yet keep its position and prestige. Local authorities do not want to uproot the villages, and in any case the village itself is already uprooted. Education for most people to-day must mean a conscious preparation for dealing with the problems of the world in which they find themselves. The Hadow Report should not be condemned too hastily.

As an active and out-spoken Modernist Churchman Sir Arnold has many delightful and wise things to say. The reminiscences of a country rector 'whose seclusion from the great world had not unfitted him for the cure of souls,' are used to contrast the past with the present. A Probation Officer brings the author up against the problem of the decline of religious observance, and of the effect of the absence of its stabilizing influence on the young lives which come into his care.

Parsons of the type who inspired Goldsmith are now rare, but the need is as great as ever for men who can give the lead and act as friendly and understanding counsellors in moments of doubt and difficulty.

> 'My own experience, both personal and at second-hand, suggests that one of the points at which local clergy of all denominations are most open to criticism is one that is easily remedied, viz., ignorance of the local machinery of social services, old-age pensions, and the like. Clergy who can tell enquirers where and how to apply for "benefit," relief, or for a pension, who can explain the conditions and elucidate and sign the needful forms, who can assist men or women in presenting a case to proper authority, are scarce. Yet nothing is more needful in a parish than a "community adviser," ready to help, in such matters, all who apply to him, irrespective of creed. The protection of the law, the benefits of social legislation, are too often hidden by a cloud of ignorance from those who need them most . . . '

In conclusion no apology is needed for quoting a passage from Mr. Baldwin which forms one of the chapter headings of this book, partly because it is a tribute to the high calling which many men of all parties see in politics to-day, partly because it summarizes the attitude which the Member for Hitchen adopts towards the duties which have been placed on him by a representative section of the people of this country.

> 'I find in the House of Commons, especially among the Labour Party, many men who fifty years ago would have gone into the Christian Ministry. They have been drawn into political life from a deep desire to help the people. Such men are common in all parties to-day . . . The electorate is intensely anxious to listen to men who have sincerely at heart the uplifting of the nation. The political career properly viewed is really a kind of Ministry.'

J. R. Bateman.

ST. CECILIA*

This book, *Music and Worship*, deals in a practical way with the whole subject of church music. The authors, at the request of the Cathedral Organists' Association, had originally intended to write a pamphlet on church music for ordinands; but the pamphlet inevitably grew into a book addressed to all who are interested in and care for the music of the church,

* *Music and Worship*. By Walford Davies and Harvey Grace. (Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1935. 6/-.)

from the cathedral organist to the humblest choirman. It should be read by all who have any responsibility for the music of the church, and the practical ideas and suggestions contained in it should be carefully considered.

At the beginning of the book the two types of church music are clearly defined. These two types may be described as music as an aid to worship and music as a vehicle of worship. The church choir supplies the former, and the choir and congregation the latter. In the words of the authors,

> 'The one (music as an aid to worship) gives an endless outlet for devoted expert service, never, it would seem, excluding a single musical worker who could and would offer to his church his most skilful service; the other (music as a vehicle of worship) giving an outlet, severely delimited, yet a fine outlet for aspiring musicians . . . It must not leave out one single worshipper whose gifts may be rudimentary but who joins in the act of worship, whether the words be sung or said.'

There is thus endless room in the church service for the ambitious and efficient choir to devote its energies to providing music as an aid to worship without in any way interfering with the rights of the congregation to take a definite part in the ordinary parish church service. Many parish churches have efficient choirs, which are given no opportunity of providing the congregation with music of a more ambitious type, simply because the clergyman or the congregation, or both, hold the mistaken idea that such is out of place in the parish church service. A choir of this kind should readily be permitted to devote its attention to the careful preparation and singing of anthems, provided, of course, that the anthems chosen are of a good type, and the congregation should be prepared to listen to such music and to take part in it as they take part in the prayers said by the officiating minister. It follows, therefore, that the congregation will sit for the anthem and will not attempt to take part in it vocally. It should, however, be clearly understood that no anthem or piece of music should be sung in church before it can be rendered in an adequate fashion in the practice room. It is still a not uncommon experience for a congregation to have to listen to a choir struggling through an anthem which has not been thoroughly mastered. No choir should attempt to sing in church music above its standard. This is no reason why difficult music should not be attempted in the practice room, for music of an exacting character will prove a valuable stimulus for the feeble choir.

Music as a vehicle for worship—that is, music in which the congregation takes a definite part: the responses, psalms and hymns—is carefully and helpfully discussed. One is glad to find the monthly congregational practice strongly advocated. A regular practice for the congregation is vital if the music of the parish church is to flourish. The best time to hold the congregational practice is before the evening service. At the practice any new hymns which are to be sung during the coming month should be learned, and occasionally new chants may be sung. It is greatly to be hoped that before long every church will have its monthly congregational practice.

An interesting suggestion in the book is for the formation of a Church Music Committee in each parish. The committee might consist of the incumbent, the choirmaster and organist, and two members of the congregation. The committee would act in a purely advisory way and might form a useful link between the organist and choir and the congregation. Anything in the least like autocracy in the Church is fatal, and it is hopeless to attempt to introduce changes in the music without the help of the con-

gregation. Several cases are quoted in the book where a congregation has been split into two, or lost, by the tactless introduction of a new hymn book. Co-operation is needed between the incumbent, the organist and the congregation, though it should be clearly realised that the incumbent is the ultimate authority on the liturgical side of the service and the organist on the musical side. In passing it may be said that the possibility of the formation of church music committees in some dioceses is not very great where there is no diocesan music committee. Most dioceses have to-day organisations for religious education, for the training of the ministry, and for evangelistic work. Why should not church music be definitely included among these diocesan activities? There is need of an official in every diocese to whom the organists and clergy of the parish churches could look for guidance and help. The Bishop of Chelmsford has already taken this step and appointed Dr. Martin Shaw as Director of Church Music for that diocese.

There is much sound advice offered to the clergy in this book. Sir Walford Davies and Dr. Grace rightly insist that every ordinand should be able to sing the service and to sing it in tune. It is gratifying that most theological colleges provide their students with some help in this matter. There are, it is true, a few people who, despite all training, remain practically tone deaf, but such men should not be allowed to attempt to sing the service. Such advice may seem absurd and unnecessary. There are, however, a number of clergy, who are quite unable to sustain a note or sing in tune, who continue to attempt to intone the service, to the grave distress of their people.

The question of the relationship between the organist and the incumbent is thoroughly discussed. It is pointed out that the relationship is usually cordial. The incumbent, if he be wise, allows his organist a free hand and interferes only when it is absolutely necessary. At the same time the legal position of the organist is unsatisfactory. He has no legal status and can be dismissed at the incumbent's will. Legally the incumbent has complete control of the music, the organ, and the choir, and the organist no rights at all. This is a very unsatisfactory position for so important a servant of the Church, and it should be remedied. Incidentally, the question of the salary of organists may be mentioned and a plea made for an increase. The average pay of the church organist is ridiculously low, and there is a tendency in many churches to cut the organist's salary when a new appointment is made. The Church has few more loyal servants than her organists and choirmasters, and church authorities should see that they are adequately paid and should remember how considerable a responsibility the organist bears.

Some excellent advice is given concerning the choice of an organist. The clergy are recommended to show preference to men who hold the diploma of the Royal College of Organists in choir training as well as in organ playing. There is still a tendency to lay too much stress on the organ-playing side. But a good choirmaster is an infinitely greater treasure than a good organ player.

The chapter on hymns and hymn singing is interesting. A good word is said for that much abused book *Hymns Ancient and Modern,* and the craze for folk-song tunes in the *English Hymnal* is deplored. Many a reader will be cheered by the good word said for 'Melita,' the tune to 'Eternal Father, strong to save,' supplanted in the *English Hymnal* and *Songs of Praise* by a folk tune. At the same time it is now generally agreed, and rightly, that if possible the *English Hymnal* or *Songs of Praise* should be

used, because these books on the whole contain better words and stronger tunes than those found in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. The people will not dislike the newer books provided they are introduced judiciously. The authors suggest an excellent plan. A general meeting of the congregation should be held at which the organist could speak about the new hymn book and enlist the sympathy of the people. Then the Church Music Committee and the Church Council should go into details, and only then, and with general consent, should the new book be introduced. Moreover, when it is adopted, the new hymns and the new tunes should be introduced slowly and for a time a large number of the old hymns should be sung.

The chapter on chants and chanting is one of the best in the book. The choirmaster who has a clear grasp of the principles enunciated here will not go far wrong. One cannot, however, wholly agree with the statement

> '. . . how unimportant the choice of a psalter is compared with a grasp of the principles underlying its use.'

It is obviously a first essential that the principles of chanting be grasped, but the choice of a good psalter is important. If it is not impossible to sing the psalms well according to the old cathedral usage, it is at least very difficult. A psalter pointed in the free rhythm style is really essential for good congregational chanting.

The book may be criticised for some of the suggestions about hymn singing. These suggestions are, it is true, found in most books on church music. There is the advice given about procuring variety by antiphonal singing, and similar devices. It is suggested, for example, that certain verses of a hymn be sung by women's voices alone and other verses by men's voices alone, and that the congregation be divided up into sections for this and similar purposes. This idea is highly impracticable. The average congregation would rightly object to such a dividing up of hymns. The hymns as a rule provide the congregations with their only opportunity for confident singing, and to confuse and deprive the congregation here is unjustified. In particular, the idea of separating the congregation in the church and encouraging men to sit in one part of the building and women in the other is wholly alien to a true congregational feeling.

It is a pity so little is found in the book about plainsong. The beauty of this ancient music of the Church is not sufficiently realised. An unfortunate idea exists that plainsong is the peculiar property of the Anglo-Catholic section of our Church. Such an idea needs to be dispelled. Plainsong is the ancient music of the Church and the property of all. The occasional use of plainsong in the parish church is valuable, and it would be a good plan if plainsong settings of the Canticles with *faux-bourdon* were more widely used. They are of great beauty and, though they are difficult to perform satisfyingly, are well worth the effort. The plainsong hymns in our Church hymn books might also be more widely used. The plainsong tunes to 'Jesu, the very thought is sweet,' 'The royal banners forward go,' 'O Christ, who art the light and day' are to be found in most hymn books and are well within the reach of the average choir.

O. R. Clarke.

ROME AND THE UNIVERSE*

It is becoming increasingly common for converts to the Church of Rome to publish their views and the reasons which have led them to take this step. Of recent years, a variety of causes have been mentioned, ranging from the number of times St. Peter is named in the text of the New Testa-

* *An Unfinished Universe*. By T. S. Gregory. (Faber and Faber. 1935. 8/6.)

ment to a morbid fear at the lack of authority which is evidenced in modern presentations of religion. Mr. T. S. Gregory is a recent convert. A minister of the Methodist Church, he has come to accept the Roman Catholic point of view and is eager to justify his change of allegiance. Yet he is careful to eschew all sentimentalism. He avoids the obvious but poor device of autobiography and confines himself to underlying causes. We would congratulate him upon the result, differ though we may from the conclusions which he has reached. He has brought a philosophical defence of real power to the service of his adopted communion, and there is much in his book which we would wish to see blazoned abroad. In the general neglect of the things of the Spirit which he sees in the modern world—a judgment in which he concurs with Berdyaev—there is a very real peril for all the churches. It is a problem which can only be neglected at the cost of disaster for religion and, as Mr. Gregory clearly shows, it is a condemnation of the present age. Yet it may be fairly questioned whether the true solution lies in the adoption of Roman Catholicism. It is perfectly true to say that the Middle Ages made modern Europe. It is the specific claim of the Church of England that it projects into the present those elements of Catholicity which it has inherited from the Christian centuries. But Rome itself is an innovator. The Post-Tridentine and Ultramontane versions of catholicity do not adequately represent the religion of the Middle Ages, however desirable or otherwise that religion may have been in its own day. A true Catholicism is democratic, and it is doubtful how far that vital factor is realized within the scope of the Papal autocracy. The reader is left with a suspicion that Mr. Gregory, having emerged from the religious individualism of Nonconformity, was blinded by the shining lights of Catholicism and capitulated to the glare of Rome without making an adequate examination of the comparative claims of other types of religious experience which would acknowledge for themselves the Catholic ethos.

It is this impression which is retained when one turns to the pages of his book. He is loud in his demand that Creator and created should not be merged. Man must learn the lesson that he is not God and that the control of the universe is in wiser and stronger hands than his own. But such a discovery is not the sole property of the Papal communion. At the heart of any version of Christianity there lies the realization that all humanism contains within itself the seeds of its own decay unless it is supplemented and expanded. The truth behind the message of Augustine, of Luther, of Barth, is just an acceptance of this fact, much as one may dislike their expanded theology. It lends point to the eschatological sociology of Berdyaev. The real fallacy underlying Mr. Gregory's *apologia* is that he has accepted the fundamental postulates of Scholasticism and he is determined to make every fact fit into his scheme. Having done this, he seeks the church which preserves to the full the tradition of Aquinas and naturally finds it in the Church of Rome. His historical allusions are scanty and leave very much to be desired. His assault upon Luther would seem to owe far more to the modern scholastic, Maritain, than to the cautious research of Professor Mackinnon. His account of the Puritans, an unflattering and unfair piece of writing, is far more violent and by no means as balanced as the judgment of the Tractarian historian, Mr. Wakeman. The Victorian agnostic, Sir Leslie Stephen, is scarcely the most reputable witness to produce as the sponsor for an attack upon the catholicity of the Church of England. His transition in argument from the claims of Imperial Rome to those of Papal Rome seems more than a little forced, whilst we must frankly acknowledge that we are at a loss either to understand or to appreciate Mr. Gregory when he commences to plead for Mariolatry. Because the modern Christian cannot

say 'Amen' to the fervid Italian devotions which are now addressed to the Virgin Mary in Roman churches, it does not mean that he shows to her a disrespect and that he rejects the Catholic Christ, but that he preserves a sense of proportion and of critical judgment.

When he deals with the fallacies of Calvinism and of Protestant Scholasticism, we entirely agree with Mr. Gregory. But it is curious that he should so completely fail to realize that exactly the same case can be made out against his own essentially Thomist position. Indeed, a very great deal is implied in his equation of the names of Aquinas and Karl Marx. But we really do wish that he had troubled to find out more about the Church of England and its claims before he had repeated the sneer that it is but the religion of Englishmen. Of course, theological modernism is only mentioned with a shudder and produced in order to be subjected to instant reprobation!

There is much to criticize. Mr. Gregory is a competent philosopher within the closed realms of scholasticism, but he is a ready example of the age-long fact that the philosopher and the historian do not live together on very easy terms. And yet, as one closes the book, one is led to feel that he has succeeded in saying a great many things which are profoundly true. It would seem to be very true to urge that the modern world has over-reached itself and that it is in grave danger of losing its soul. It is attempting to exist upon secularistic negations and upon racial selfishness. Again, it would seem to be true to say that a religious individualism is powerless to meet the situation. It has tried and has failed badly. A deeper remedy must be found. But it does not seem to be true to say that these admissions must, of necessity, lead one into the Roman fold, with an acceptance of all that such a step implies both intellectually and theologically. We would commend to any who may feel as does Mr. Gregory upon this matter, the bitter remark of Father Tyrrell: 'Has Catholicism come to this at last! So grand a name for so mean a thing.'

The real fallacy is the all but complete ignoring of the problem of authority. Either authority is a paling or else it is an atmosphere. With the break-up of the view of revelation as propositional, the view of authority as something marked out by rigid bounds is likewise destroyed. An acceptance of the modern view of revelation as progressive likewise forces the conclusion that the authority of the historical church is that of a broad ethos. Historical criticism, whether in the realm of Biblical studies or of church history, has destroyed for ever the old infallibilities. It is all but impossible to rehabilitate them, to restore the rigid view of authority, to again defend the propositional view of revelation. Indeed, the Papanized Barthianism of Mr. Gregory would seem but the last surviving and despairing method of accomplishing the impossible. When one has stripped away the host of epigrams with which the work is garnished, one finds the basic assumption of 'An Unfinished Universe' to be a rigid view of authority. It is not argued, it is assumed. Yet, nowhere is there an answer to the charge brought against this view and ably voiced by Professor Berdyaev: 'A dictatorship over the spirit abolishes creative liberty and corrupts the culturally creative . . . A dictated world-view paralyses creative conscience and the only thing which can stand against it is the heroic resistance of free conscience' (*The Fate of Man*, p. 116*f*).

When he sketches his Papal ecclesiastical policy, Mr. Gregory shows a curious delusion. Rome is dynamic and all other churches are static. He ignores the Eastern Orthodox Church, not knowing where to place it. To make such a claim for a church which deliberately refuses new knowledge is a strange assertion. It is for those who recognise the abiding value of

the age-long Christian tradition and yet who recognize experience as their authority to claim that they have a dynamic view of the Faith. But one clear fact emerges from any discussion of the points which Mr. Gregory has raised. The older type of Protestantism is fast breaking up. It may be doubted whether it has any future as a formulative influence in religious thought. Yet, what will take its place? There is always the danger of secularism. Mr. Gregory sees this and claims that Rome is the only bulwark of defence against this tide. But it is not so. There is another type of Catholicism, a broad ethos, which is truly dynamic, for it is itself progressive and ready to absorb new knowledge and new thought-forms. As the universe journeys on its way, there is every hope of this type of Catholicism growing and expanding. Its accepted data are the traditional Christian foundations and the centuries of Christian experience. It is this data which it has to adapt to every advance of knowledge. It will not supplant Rome any more than it will supplant Fundamentalism, for both are a refuge for persons of differing temperaments who desire an outward authority. But it will provide an answer to the problems of faith and life, in a manner impossible to the Church of Rome and lacking in its historical difficulties.

The Roman controversy is hackneyed and one approaches it once again with no little distaste. Yet Mr. Gregory has made it into a living reality and, much as we differ from him, we must thank him for an interesting and readable volume.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TO-DAY*

'In general, a good translation should be a transcript, in the idioms of one language, of the ideas expressed by the original author in the idioms of another.' And following this axiom Dr. Wade has given us a new translation of the New Testament.

It is written in good modern English and made from a Greek text substantially that of Westcott and Hort, though often the marginal readings of these scholars have been preferred to their text, their punctuation has been sometimes disregarded, certain conjectural emendations have been adopted and the more notable 'Western additions' appear enclosed within pointed brackets. The aim throughout has been to avoid obscurity.

> 'Where the significance of the original is disputable,' Dr. Wade tells us, he 'has tried to convey to the reader, without any ambiguity, that meaning which, after much consideration, he has judged to be the most probable.'

As a specimen passage may be cited *Rom.* iv, 1, 2:

> 'What, then (*it may be asked*), are we to say of Abraham, the ancestor from whom we Jews derive our physical descent? For if he was set right with God on account of his works, he really has reason for claiming merit. *The reply is, Only before his fellow men, but* not before God.'

The different books themselves are arranged in what the translator conceives to be the chronological order of their appearance, starting with *I Thess.* and ending with the un-Pauline parts of the Pastorals. One letter to Corinth and three fragments are independently treated, likewise four

* *The Documents of the New Testament,* translated and historically arranged, with critical introductions by G. W. Wade, D.D. (London: Thomas Murky and Co. 1934. 10/6 net.)

fragments to Timothy, one to Titus, and a 'Fragment of an Epistle to Ephesus (=*Rom.* 16).'

Each book or fragment is preceded by an introduction, commendable for its brevity and lucidity of expression, and before the whole Dr. Wade has written an 'Introduction to the Historical Study of the N.T.,' which treats of (i) The Circumstances producing the Gospels, (ii) The Miracles in the N.T., (iii) Some O.T. passages, cited in the N.T., considered in the light of Modern Criticism; and concludes with a Note on the Canon of the N.T.—all in 45 pages. Moreover the table of probable order and dates of the N.T. Documents will be found helpful for casual reference.

To compliment one of Dr. Wade's eminence would be impertinent for any but the most senior of workers in the field of Biblical Studies; but it is fortunately rendered unnecessary, for the Bishop of Monmouth has already contributed a Foreword commending the book without reservation, as a

> 'concise statement of the principal issues of New Testament criticism, as they present themselves to those who loyally and reverently accept the Church's faith in Jesus Christ.'

HEDLEY F. D. SPARKS.

HOLISM AND CHRISTIANITY*

General Smuts, in his well-known book, *Holism,* has these words:

> 'There is not a problem of Metaphysics, of Ethics, of Art, and even of Religion which will not benefit enormously from contact with the concept of Holism. . . . These applications of the concept of Holism lie beyond the scope of the present work.'

General Smuts held out a promise that in future volumes he would do something to fill out the sketch which he had already provided, and show how the concept of Nature as essentially a creator of wholes of ever-increasing complexity and unity, sheds an illumination upon almost every field of knowledge. In the meantime his striking theory does not seem to have had the effect which one might have expected. This small book is especially interesting in that it attempts to show how Christianity and Holism give us interpretations of the world which are in close harmony.

But it gives us more than abstract speculation. Just as General Smuts' work was the product of wide experience and deep thought upon it, rather than of specialised study, so also this book, by a headmaster of long experience, is a fruit of the same tree, and has the freshness and vigour, which a man who has formed his thought from life first and books afterwards, can always bring to his work.

Part I deals with the 'Jig-Saw Puzzle of Modern Culture'; Part II with the 'Reconstruction of a Faith.' We are shown in Part I how we have 'taken the jig-saw puzzle of culture to pieces, have lost the key and are playing with the bits.' The key that is lost is a true and admitted norm of conduct. Is the norm Christ or Nature? Most of us give a hesitating answer, and are forced to carry on our commerce with the world in a double currency. What we want is to return to a gold standard. But which is it to be? The successive impacts of criticism, mechanism, evolution, and psychology with its seeming reduction of all aspiration to sex or glands, have unsettled and bewildered us. New ideas, as they find their way down from the studies and laboratories where they are minted, to become current coin, lose something of their brilliance, and are apt to be noticed most for

* *The Fading Margin: A Study in Evolutionary and Christian Ethics.* By E. C. Owen, M.A., Head Master of Lyttelton School, Malvern. (Basil Blackwell. 1934. Price 5/-.)

what they deny. So it seems that modern culture is possessed of a destructive spirit. We have lost our way; and what is worse, lost confidence in ourselves. Because the ordinary man can make nothing of the world, he too often assumes that there is nothing to be made of it. But there is one thing that he can grasp, and that one thing points a way out. He can understand that we need more friendliness and more co-operation; that 'departmentalism of soul' in race, class or colour must give way to mutual respect and understanding. He can, in short, grasp the Holistic idea of a 'world struggling for unity.' So ends the first part of the book.

Part II, 'The Reconstruction of a Faith,' takes us through an ascending series: Materialism, Idealism, the validity of emotion and aspiration, to the Johannine Christ. Here we find a creed and a way of life exalted and at the same time congruous with the view of Nature which Holism suggests. The Vine and the Branches; the 'Eternal' life of self-sacrificing devotion; these supply once more the key we are looking for. And lest they should seem, like Lippman's 'high religion,' to be beyond the intellect of ordinary men to grasp, and beyond their powers to fulfil, we are shown elsewhere in the Gospels that these ideals are no more than the unlimited extension of what we can all understand; common friendliness, ready always for small sacrifices and ready also for great sacrifices if the end is assured. So, reaching the same conclusion by a different route, the argument is rounded off by a fine chapter on Immortality, and a concluding restatement, in the light of the whole book, of the alternative standards before us, 'Christ or Chaos?'

An outline of the book so compressed seems perhaps familiar and easy. There are many questions we should like to ask. It is not, we believe, in accordance with General Smuts' thought that the 'herd' should be thought of as a higher whole than personality, which for him is supreme. And this is a truth which should be kept absolutely clear, or we find ourselves supporting a theory of the State which, by allowing it to make of the individuals composing it nothing but a means for its own advancement, would destroy the very central doctrine of Christianity. The truth would seem to be not that social groups are higher products than personality (after all, there were herds and families before personalities come on the scene at all), but that personality is only fully developed in social relations.

It is odd to find one who has, after all, written a book of theology, taking more than one opportunity of expressing a contempt for the subject. This or that 'may be good or bad theology,' says Mr. Owen, 'but we are thinking on the plane of life, not of theology.' So far has the Queen of the Sciences sunk!

But these are small points. There is much more in this little book of 160 pages than a summary of its argument can well indicate. It is delightfully easy to read; full of sound sense and happy illustration. We enjoyed the story, *à propos* of Mechanism, of the young man in the dock who said, 'I was fated to commit this crime.' 'Yes, young man,' said the judge, 'and I was fated to condemn you.' And, as showing the attitude of youth to 'questions about which orthodoxy is apt to excite itself,' of the Sixth Form boy, who, invited to write on 'What do you think of the Prayer-book Controversy?', wrote shortly and to the point, 'I do not think of it at all.' The boy, we are told, was an able boy and a regular communicant. There must be many of the same temper who 'do not think at all' of the Prayer-book controversy and its like, but who would think, with pleasure and profit, if the matter provided were as practical and honest as this.

R. J. Stanford.

BROADCAST SERMONS*

Broadcast talks, seen in the cold light of print, have a way of being even more disappointing than the average printed lecture or sermon. When the personality of the speaker has evaporated (if it survived the intervening machinery) it often happens that there is little interest left. This volume is less disappointing than most, either through the nature of the subject, or because the personality of the speakers has managed to force itself, in part at any rate, past the double distorting media of microphone and print.

It consists of the first part of a series entitled *The Way to God,* the second part of which will be published in September of this year. There is a foreword by the Archbishop of York, containing some wise words about the different points of view which are to be illustrated in the series, and the necessity of avoiding bewilderment and mental muddle therefrom, and an introductory talk by the Religious Director of the B.B.C., the Rev. F. A. Iremonger. He rightly insists upon the necessity of the listener taking an active part and not expecting to be passively educated. He outlines the questions which are to be asked and discussed in the course; it will be shown that Christianity has an answer for a world which is seeking for a meaning in life, and to the endless doubts raised by modern scientific research and philosophy.

The main part of this volume is taken up by two groups of talks: one by that eminent Free Churchman, the Rev. J. S. Whale, President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, and the other by the Dean of St. Paul's. Mr. Whale has two talks on 'What is Man?' his headings being 'Human Nature' and 'Man's Need of God,' and a third answering listeners' questions; and Dr. Matthews, under the heading 'Does God Speak?' deals in three talks with the revelation of God in the world around us, through the voice of conscience and of reason within us, and through God's prophets. He also allots an extra talk to answering questions.

To the so-called 'plain man' who is presumed to listen to broadcast talks it is probable that Dr. Matthews was the more interesting. His remarks on his correspondence certainly suggest this. Mr. Whale had the more difficult task, that of providing a popular metaphysical basis for the whole series, and he does it without any of the technical terms of philosophy. It cannot have been easy, but is adequately carried out.

The subject of the revelation of God, on the other hand, can be discussed in so much more concrete a fashion. For the revelation of God in the world, Dr. Matthews takes his stand upon the supremacy of mind and of personality; in his chapter on God's voice within us he has some sensible warnings about the Oxford Groups and claims to personal divine guidance. The third chapter, on God's revelation through His prophets, rightly includes something about the phenomenon of mysticism, not only in its Christian form, but also as found in other religions, and about the inspiration of works of art and the place they have in the revelation of the voice of God.

The questions which listeners sent after this second group of talks are highly instructive, and deal with most of the fundamental problems. Dr. Matthews groups them under six heads. Why do we argue and reason, if we really were told to be as little children? If you infer the existence of God from the personality of good men, why do you not infer the existence

* *The Way to God*: being the Broadcast Talks (first series) by the Rev. F. A. Iremonger, the Rev. J. S. Whale, and the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, with a foreword by His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York. (Student Christian Movement Press. 1935. Price 3/6.)

of the devil as a parallel creator, from the existence of bad men? Third comes the problem of evil—why does God allow so much evil and human suffering in the world? Why did not or does not God reveal himself in such a manner as to make doubt impossible? Why do the commands of conscience vary so much in different ages and places? Lastly, how are we to recognise God's prophets as such, when they do appear?

One would not expect anything new in a book of this sort, but it is valuable as throwing much light upon the difficulties of laymen, and the way in which they may be helped to find a solution. We look forward with interest to the appearance of the second volume of the series.

W. H. Oldaker.

TELL EL-AMARNA*

The discovery of the Tell el-Amarna tables containing letters written in cuneiform in the diplomatic Babylonian of the period, and sent mainly by the vassal kings of Asia to Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV, *c.* 1409 B.C.) or to his father Amenhotep III (fl. 1411 B.C.), has made Amarna known to a wide circle of students, including students of the Bible. But this is only one of the remarkable discoveries made during excavations of the site extending over forty years. The discovery of an artistic masterpiece, the head of Nefertite, has brought world-wide fame to Amarna, and made it a household word. Moreover, other circumstances combined to give the city an extraordinary fascination and interest. Mr. J. D. S. Pendlebury writes:

> 'There must be, I think, some inherent romance in the idea of a royal city, built at the whim of a Pharaoh in a hitherto uninhabited spot, founded, inhabited and deserted within the half of a generation and left a wilderness again to this day. It was for its short span of life the capital of the greatest empire in the world. It was the scene of a fantastic experiment in monotheism while that empire was going to rack and ruin. In it was despatched the whole of the business of the realm. In its streets were represented all the nations of the known world, Minoans, Mycenaeans, Cypriots, Babylonians, Hittites, Jews and a score of other races, while in the background the old life of Egypt went on unchanged and unaffected.'

Amenhotep IV or Akhenaten, the founder of the city, has been proclaimed a kind of Messiah, a religious reformer. A reformer he was in the sense that he desired change. He changed his city, he changed his name, he changed his god. It may be doubted, however, whether he had any great interest in religion. A 'modernist' he certainly was, but hardly in a religious sense. He had no prophetic message. The bright, warm sun in whose rays he could bask and practise his 'nudism' was for him the only god. This god, the Aten, says Mr. Pendlebury, is a purely creative god.

> 'He has made all things living and he has provided for their wants, but there his work ends. There is no feeling that he will reward good or punish evil. There is no sense of sin, or indeed of right and wrong. And that is a clue to the Amarna age. It is absolutely unmoral. We can see it most plainly in their art. They have cast aside the standards which had ruled their ancestors. That is why for the first time in the history of Egyptian art we find so many really bad works at the same time as works of the first order. The Egyptians had never sunk below a certain level, even if they had not very often risen far above it. But for a parallel to the combination of genius and thoroughly bad art in

* *Tell el-Amarna.* By J. D. S. Pendlebury. (Lovat Dickson and Thompson. 1935. 6/- net.)

this period we can only turn to Crete, and it must be remembered that to many people the Minoan civilization gives just the same impression of the unmoral.'

Only once at Amarna, according to Mr. Pendlebury, is there any touch of the conventional morality.

> 'In one short passage in his tomb Tutu says that he did not pervert justice for profit. Otherwise in Amarna there is continual boasting that truth is followed and falsehood spurned. But truth was a fetish with Akhenaten. He always speaks of living in truth, but it was not the truth of Darius the Persian; it was the truth of any wild artist who says "That is how I see it."'

In any case, it is to the king and not to the god that the nobles look for their reward. No wonder that no theory of any life after death was put forward! 'That would have implied some standard of behaviour in this world.' Perhaps, however, Akhenaten came to believe that he would live for ever! In any case,

> 'to-day the impression that the art and civilization of Amarna gives us is that of an ephemeral butterfly age with that total lack of moral standards usually associated with happy morons.'

Mr. Pendlebury deals, of course, with much more than the religion of the age. Separate chapters are devoted to the History, the Site, the Public Buildings, Art, Religion and Letters. In a concluding chapter the author points out how much more work requires to be done to fill up the gaps in our knowledge. The excavation of the Central City and the Official Quarters is still unfinished. More cuneiform tablets may be discovered. We may learn more of the actual form of worship concerning which at present we are desperately ignorant; and certain architectural problems still await solution.

M. A. Canney.

THE HISTORICAL SOURCES OF CHRISTIANITY*

Four American theologians have produced a handbook, the avowed intention of which is

> 'to set forth in clear language and without too much use of technical terminology, a bird's-eye view of the long course of development which resulted eventually in the beliefs and practices, hopes and expectations, of the New Testament Church.'

In this way they have succeeded, and their work comprises an excellent introduction to the study of the evolution of Judaism and the emergence of Christianity. The book will be extremely useful to the general reader, and is admirably fitted to form the basis of a course for a study-group within a church. At the end of each chapter there is a fairly comprehensive list of books for further reading, and throughout the use of the Biblical text is strongly urged and encouraged; the book lacks an index, but this is no great drawback, since it is not a technical treatise, and does not set out to make any original contribution to our knowledge of the subject.

The first half of the book deals with the Old Testament, and Chs. I and II discuss the religion of Moses and of Early Israel; the following chapters are concerned with the Writing Prophets and the Wisdom Literature. This section of the book concludes with a timely discussion of the Judaism just

* *The Beginnings of Our Religion.* By F. James, C. B. Hedrick, B. S. Easton and F. C. Grant. (S.P.C.K. 1934. 3/6.)

prior to, and contemporary with the beginnings of Christianity. The chapter is particularly valuable, for as the author points out:

> 'We now recognize that the Jewish religion in the days of our Lord, and during the two or three hundred years before our era, was a far more virile and vital religion than the "empty formalism" and "Pharisaic hypocrisy," with which it used to be charged. There was a vital religion in the period between the Old and New Testaments, and there was religious progress. It is unfortunate that the grouping of the Scriptures into the two "Testaments," leaving out of sight the books of the "Apocrypha" and the other Jewish writings of the period, has left a great gulf in the Protestant view of sacred history: a gulf which was made to appear due to the absence of creative religious thought and practice. The real importance of the period is to be seen from the fact that many of the ideas and much of the language of the New Testament are simply incomprehensible apart from the Judaism of the two hundred years before the birth of Christ.'

The second part of the book commences with a chapter entitled 'Our Lord,' which stresses the fact that the religion of Jesus came into being primarily as a form of Jewish Messianism, and that the root-motive in the teaching of Jesus was to transform and perfect the religion of His fathers by introducing a new emphasis on Love, and by purging it of the contemporary failure to observe its highest elements. The author begins his study with the Baptism of Jesus and concludes with the Crucifixion, strictly confining himself to the subject of the book as a whole, and leaving aside all theological theories.

There follow two extremely good chapters by C. B. Hedrick on the Christianity of S. Paul and S. John respectively. The characteristic doctrines of these Apostles are expounded in a clear, comprehensive and unbiassed way; thus for example, an article of the Pauline Creed is summed up:

> 'I believe that Jesus, the Messiah, is the Son of God, and that His death upon the cross was a voluntary act of love in which He gave Himself for me; and that this love of Christ is none other than the love of God, who was in Christ, reconciling the world, both Jewish and Gentile, unto Himself.'

Dr. Easton contributes a chapter entitled 'The Beginnings of the Church,' and finally the threads of the work as a whole are adequately drawn together in the concluding chapter.

This inexpensive book is well worth consideration by any who are seeking a subject for a study-group. It has continuity and clarity, and should provide a stimulus for further reading. And, of course, knowledge of the subject it treats is essential to a true understanding of personal religion.

G. F. Cope.

PSYCHOLOGY, PREACHING, AND THE PERSON OF JESUS*

These chapters constitute the Beecher Lectures on preaching at Yale for 1934. It is a book to preachers by a preacher, but contains much which would be of great value to the layman as well. Each lecture not only is a message on preaching; each one is also a fine sermon in its own right. The author believes that preaching is an art, and that each sermon is like a picture painted in words. Unfortunately, perhaps, the preacher

**Jesus and Human Personality.* By Albert Edward Day. (Abingdon Press, U.S.A. 1935. $2.)

is forced to be a combination of artist, practical man, and journalist. He has a 'dead-line' which must be met at 11 o'clock each Sunday morning; and it is not always possible to form his vision into adequate words by that time. Sometimes there is a failure; at other times there is unexpected success; and the preacher cannot always know the result until after he is in the pulpit (and frequently not until the service is over). Preaching, like the other arts, has its technique and stringent requirements. It cannot violate logic, it must meet *actual* needs, it must be attractive to the minds of its hearers.

The author attempts to answer two fundamental problems of modern preaching: 'What is the nature of personality?' and 'Have we in Jesus the answer to the demands of personality?' With excellent illustrations, and with perfect delivery (the book reads with the charm of a novel), the writer deals with personality in the light of modern society, with the 'secret of personality,' with the concept of the 'ideal person,' with success, self-respect, comradeship (one of the outstanding chapters in both insight and presentation), with moral failure, and, finally, with the realization of Jesus.

Above all, it is the influence of Jesus, freed from the bonds of the past and presented anew to the people of the world in all His glory and manliness, which will be the transforming power of religion. This is not a new concept, but it is presented in this book in a new way (which will appeal most to scientifically trained ministers); a way, moreover, which is vitally needed by the more progressive clergy of all the Churches of the world.

Yale University. RANDOLPH C. MILLER.

SOME POPULAR SERMONS*

It is a curious impulse that urges preachers to publish their sermons. Even the best of sermons find cold print an unsuitable medium. The present volume is a book of sermons which certainly can make no claim as literature. They were evidently addressed to American hearers and, we fear, they have not gained in value by crossing the Atlantic in book form, and presented by their British publishers under a startling title in an equally startling wrapper.

There is an American temperament and there is an English temperament, and each has its different bloom. Dr. Fosdick has that peculiar American gift of a man speaking to his brother with a hearty candour, which we, with our reserves, welcome with as little enthusiasm as a hearty slap on the back. His imagery is homely and he allows himself a freedom in the use of the English language which disturbs the critical reader. The sermons contain little that could be termed theology, but they are alive and sincere and practical. Such subjects as 'The high uses of trouble,' 'The cure of disillusionment,' 'The making Christianity too easy,' 'A plea for true individualism' are treated with a simple, brave philosophy that is altogether admirable.

Mr. Fosdick is a humanitarian, large hearted and liberal spirited, and his words have a message of 'brotherliness, friendship and neighbourly love.' He is, moreover, an enthusiastic pacifist. Pacifist propaganda is very active in the world to-day and the number of pacifists is daily increasing. Everyone will sympathise with their aim, but are they not misleading us when they endeavour to identify Pacifism with Christianity? Much time seems to be lost in mere denunciation. Is it not better to allow discrimination to develop as the spontaneous consequence of the more primary Christian principles? JOSEPH MCDONALD.

* *The Secret of Victorious Living.* Twenty-five sermons on Christianity to-day. By Dr. Fosdick. (Student Christian Movement Press. 1935. 6/- net.)

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHRISTIAN'S DILEMMA.

SIR,

The article 'The Christian's Dilemma,' in the May number of the *Modern Churchman* has caused me such concern that I venture to make some observations upon it. They fall under three main headings.

(1) The whole article displays a disarming ingenuousness which one finds hard to resist. But even if one passes over the apparent belief in the truth of the 'war guilt lie,' one finds it impossible to accept the distinction drawn between righteous and unrighteous wars. What war has not been considered a righteous war by both sides? It is true that Englishmen engaged in the last war because they believed it was a righteous war, but did not Germans also think that it was righteous? By your own showing wars in defence of one's country are righteous and even if it was a lie sedulously cultivated by the German authorities, yet many Germans believed that their country was being encircled by the other great powers envious of Germany's growing share in foreign markets. This one illustration shows the utter improbability of States keeping out of war because they are not convinced that their cause is righteous.

How is it possible after the last war, when conventions against the use of certain arms were disregarded by both sides, to believe in a war 'fought in the most humane way possible'? Is there the slightest chance that such conventions will be any more closely observed in future wars, especially seeing that scientists have perfected weapons of destruction for use solely against the civilian masses?

As in any future war victory will almost certainly go to the nation that can at the outset deliver a smashing blow, and since an air attack on a large scale could not only seriously interfere with the mobilisation of the enemy, but also seriously undermine the morale of the civilian population, there is every encouragement for a nation threatened by war to strike at once if it feels itself to have the advantage and not to waste time deciding whether the war will be righteous or unrighteous. Consequently, on a realist view the distinction between righteous and unrighteous wars is one that is not likely to stop a single war and is all the less likely since as you point out, the 'background of Christian consciousness' (where the distinction between righteous and unrighteous war is most likely to be made), is entirely lacking in some nations.

Finally, the fallacy of drawing a comparison between national police forces and national armies has so frequently been pointed out, particularly by 'The New Commonwealth' (the international society of which the late Lord Gladstone of Hawarden was President), that I will not further discuss it.

(2) The ethical standpoint of the article seems below that which is distinctively Christian, even if, to avoid justifiable criticism, no reliance is placed on proof texts. You yourself state that there is 'an ethical evolution as well as a biological evolution.' That being so, is it not possible that this ethical evolution has been in progress since Article xxxvii was written? Surely to this question there is evidence to show that the answer is what reason would suggest it to be. An example of the ethical evolution since Article xxxvii was written, is provided by the Christian attitude to slavery, which universally reprobated by Christians now, was justified by sincere Christians at least as late as the end of the eighteenth century.

But the ethical standpoint of the article is still open to serious criticism, even if the argument above is rejected. Where is there the least justification in the Old Testament (except in parts Modernists would reject as guides to morals) or the New Testament for the view that 'wars fought in defence of national territory . . .' are righteous? This view is surely in direct contrast with what may legitimately be called one of the ethical principles of the Scriptures, namely that evil may not be done that good may come. It is difficult to understand how or why this principle may be suspended in the interests of expediency when war is in question.

For the argument that Britain should not allow itself to suffer 'national martyrdom' is based purely on expediency. There is not a Christian unity, on the broadest basis, and there is therefore not the 'background of Christian consciousness' necessary to make 'national martyrdom effective for propagandist purposes.' That is a surmise which it would be rash to deny, but one can strongly contest the statements upon which it is founded, even if it is held that expediency requires or justifies Great Britain to be false to its convictions. One of the chief concerns of Isaiah (as of Hosea) was to prevent Judah trying by military measures (either of its own or of its dearly bought allies) to resist the onslaught of Assyria (*e.g. Isaiah* xxxi, 3), not, of course, because Isaiah thought that war was an evil from which the nation must at all costs keep itself pure, but because Yahweh is strong to save all that trust in him (*e.g. Isaiah* vii, 9). It would be interesting to know what reason there is for the view that God is not able equally now to save by many or by few. In other words, it seems apparent that if the nation had faith, it could be saved and that the 'national martyrdom' envisaged as the result of passive resistance is by no means inevitable. In any case the wholesale massacre from the air of the civilian population in which the next war will largely consist, makes it difficult to conceive of anything worse than war—the chief justification of which is that it is a means of preventing greater evil.

(3) The interpretation put upon some of the 'signs of the times' is open to serious criticism. It is stated that the lack of Christian unity in the broadest sense renders the Church completely ineffectual—'it is futile for the Christian Churches to go on denouncing war and protesting against an increase of armaments. Such action costs nothing.' Hence the absence of the 'background of Christian consciousness' deplored above. It would be idle to deny that the Church's voice against war is largely ineffectual, but is it for the reason stated? Is it not possible that its witness is ineffectual largely because the non-Christian, incapable of the subtle dichotomy between righteous and unrighteous wars, is yet aware, as apparently the theologians are not, that future wars will chiefly consist in attacks on the civilian population, and has therefore decided for himself that to prevent such a ghastly contingency it is safest to decide that all war is wrong? If he finds that the Churches are prepared to justify what he himself condemns it is not surprising if he decides he has little use for them.

And finally is there not evidence that the rhetorical question about the world becoming less Christian is wrong? Admittedly the influence of the Churches may be getting less, but it is exceedingly doubtful whether the influence of Christ is getting less. I would suggest that the recently published report of the British and Foreign Bible Society points strongly to the conclusion that the influence of Christ is increasing throughout the world.

R. A. Minter.

St. Paul's College,
Burgh, Lincs.
May 25th, 1935.

SIR,

As your arguments in support of Christians who feel impelled to participate in a future war are primarily based on the assumption that the war must be righteous, may I respectfully point out that *every* war is considered 'righteous' by those who wage it. Passing through Germany last summer this point was impressed on me by a fanatical young Nazi who was ready with an answer to every accusation made by the Allies. This is not the place, nor am I equipped to say how far his defence was valid, but without question he believed it to be so. Germany's statement that she was an innocent victim may be a cynical pose on the part of some of her rulers, but it is certainly a genuine conviction in the minds of the people. In the unhappy event of another world conflict we are told by experts that the only effective defence from the air is attack. It will almost certainly come upon us suddenly, it will quite certainly be presented to us through the Press as a 'righteous war.' In spite of your able and sympathetic article I still feel that an honest follower of Christ *cannot* participate nor even acquiesce in the wholesale slaughter of his fellow men by bombs and poison gas. This standpoint in no way impugns the sincerity and heroism of those who died in battle and called themselves Christians. It is only since the Great War and the sinister development of aerial transport that this terrific paradox has been apparent. A united Church might even now stem the tide of nationalism which, cloaked in ancient shibboleths and tradition, threatens to tear down the God of Love and replace Him by the God of Power.

OLIVE POPPLEWELL.

Beechlands, Malvern Wells.
May 25th, 1935.

SIR,

As you truly say, 'certain conditions have to be present before martyrdom can be effective for propagandist purposes.' Is it not possible that to a pagan and militarist people it might seem like the self-immolation of a degenerate and savage tribe as an offering to Moloch? Mr. Leyton Richards in *The Christian's Alternative to War* thinks that the martyrdom of an entire nation 'would inevitably stir the conscience of mankind, and mark the beginning of the end of war.' But you cannot stir a conscience which is not there to be stirred. And is such a martyrdom feasible at all? A Government might conceivably abdicate its responsibility for the defence of its people, as a stepmother deserting her children, but it would be quite impossible to rely on the support of the whole nation; and without such support it would be a ghastly failure

Arming is not the ideal way to end war, but an armed peace is a great deal better than war. Even Mr. Leyton Richards and his friends are forced to argue against themselves in their letter to *The Times* of June 21st. 'When the just claims of Germany have been met this country must be no less determined to resist any German schemes for hegemony or domination.' How are we to resist? How is the Good Samaritan to treat highwaymen if he catches them at work? It is largely, I think, a question of degree. How much will a good pacifist stand before he hits back? Insults might be as jewels in his crown, but if a few drunken soldiers from an invading army began to kill his wife and children by slow torture, cutting off one limb at a time, his principles would go to the winds, he would seize any weapon within reach, and pray for the help of a God in the form of a few well-armed Englishmen. If he did not, he would be not only sub-Christian but less than human.

'Support the weak, help the afflicted.' So runs the new Confirmation blessing. If it is a Christian duty to relieve suffering is it not equally a Christian duty to prevent suffering? 'The condemnation of the one side is the justification of the other.' These words of J. B. Mozley, quoted last October by Canon J. K. Mozley in St. Paul's Cathedral, still ring true. But if the famous war sermons of Mozley and James Martineau have a far away sound to-day, the essays of Emmet and Glazebrook in *The Faith and the War* (1916) deserve to be read and re-read by all pacifists.

You quote Article xxxvii. May I add a bit of Harold Browne's exposition? 'If Christian nations may never resist aggression, or defend the weak, civilization and religion would be hourly exposed to destruction from the invasion of barbarans and unbelievers. In such a case, the Gospel would have established the supremacy of the violent and the ungodly.' The nation which will not defend its own temples from sacrilege may find itself saying too late, 'O God, the heathen are come into thine inheritance: thy holy temple have they defiled, and made Jerusalem a heap of stones.' According to Dr. G. K. Bowes in *The Hibbert Journal* of last January, 'those nations which renounce war end inevitably in becoming the prey of those nations which do not renounce it. There is no escape. . . . Nor can any nation or league of nations which makes peace its ideal fail to become the prey of that nation which makes war its ideal.' Personally I believe we are right to make peace our ideal, and therefore wrong if we renounce preparation for defence. If we are to build the Temple of Peace in our time, we must build it with the sword beside us, like the Jews in the fourth chapter of *Nehemiah,* lest we be unable to finish it. For it is worth building and it can be built, but only if the whole nation will help to build it. And that means co-operation without suspicion between the Church, the State, and the armed forces of the Crown.

T. F. Royds.

Haughton Rectory, Stafford.
June 26th, 1935.

Sir,

I fail to see that the really Modernist Christian need feel himself in any dilemma in supporting adequate national defence. Unlike the Fundamentalist, he need no more be bound by the textual inerrancy of Scripture in regard to war and peace than he is by such texts in regard to a certain order of alleged 'miracles,' the indissolubility of marriage, or the Virgin Birth of Jesus. Granted that the New Testament contains a certain stratum of Pacifist thought, the Modernist might be expected to exercise common sense and discrimination in his study of this facet of the primitive Christian ethic.

The Brethren expected the early Second Coming, and that they would be 'caught up to meet the Lord in the clouds.' Possessed by such a belief they would have been fools indeed to fight for the things of this world. Moreover, they had learnt that they could not hope to acquire adequate physical force to contend against the power of Imperial Rome. In any case they had no country to fight for materially and no national traditions to defend.

So far as the Old Testament is concerned, it is obvious that certain of the major Prophets who strove to prevent their people from taking up arms against Assyria had the realist sense, recognising that the disunited little Kingdom was no more capable of contending successfully against that great power than, in modern times, Belgium single-handed would be capable of waging a triumphant war against Germany. Is that a reason why a mighty

empire like the British, the main bulwark of liberty and justice, should refuse to protect its secular and spiritual inheritance? Does the alleged fact that the Disciples held all things in common make it incumbent on us to abolish private property and establish a British Communist State?

The example of Manchukuo and the probable destiny of the whole of China constitute a warning of what will happen to any people—however numerous and potentially powerful—which surrenders its right of self-defence.

It is idle, in a world of varying standards of ethics and cultures and material development, to expect to maintain peace, security and comfort without being prepared to defend them. To establish the doctrine of non-resistance among the most civilized sections of mankind is implicitly to establish the supremacy of those others who believe in the right of might. The abolition of the police would not tame or moralise the 'tough.' Is not Jesus supposed to have used force to expel the money-changers from the Temple? The story may be fiction, but it presents a most heartening and inspiring picture of the Master in comparison with his pacifist followers of to-day.

Without armed force slavery would not have been suppressed. Without armed forced the Soudan would never have been rescued from the ferocious fanaticism of the Mahdi. Without armed force India would be an ocean of red anarchy. Where is the 'dilemma' of the Modernist Christian who faces the facts of life squarely?

No reasonable subject of the King would hesitate to make any possible sacrifice to preserve peace. No one in this country wants war. The greatest insurance to-day against war is a strong Britain, prepared to repel aggression.

F. Victor Fisher.

49 Haverstock Hill,
Hampstead, N.W.3.
12th June, 1935.

Sir,

An undergraduate once asked the late Professor Jowett, 'What would you do, Master, supposing a murderer in pursuit of his victim inquired of you which way the latter had fled, and you knew? Would you tell a lie or would you give the information?'

Dr. Jowett replied, 'I suppose I should tell the lie, but I should prefer not to contemplate it beforehand or attempt to justify it afterwards.'

Would not this reply be applicable to war? Both war and lying are always evil, but sometimes you are in a position where you have to choose the lesser evil. Strictly, a Christian ought to avoid ever being in such a position. We of the 'C. of E.' however cannot hope to escape it, for did not a witty member of Balliol once declare that 'Choice of Evils' is the true interpretation of those initial letters?

J. N. Newland-Smith.

The Rectory,
Teigngrace, S. Devon.
June 5th, 1935.

Sir,

Your balanced article on 'The Christian's Dilemma' reminded me of the following quotation from the *Study of History*, by Bishop Stubbs of Oxford.

'Of course an objector may say, "Your argument involves doing evil that good may come" (*i.e.* using force to protect a right cause). My reply would

be, "That cuts both ways. The man who refuses to defend the right cause even with force would be (in my view) doing evil (by omission) in order to preserve peace." So the argument is invalid though plausible. The great necessity of practical judgment is patience and tolerance and . . . the highest justice must be content for a time to see many things continue wrong that cannot be righted without a greater wrong.'

H. A. DALLAS.

9 Perryfield Road,
Crawley.

SIR,

I wish to thank you for publishing my letter on the war question. Since I wrote to you I have read Canon Raven's Halley Stewart Lecture, *Is War Obsolete?* This brilliantly thought-out book puts forward the point of view that was wanting. It sets forth, it seems to me, an ideal which all Christian pacifists, in fact, all Christians, might aim at, and one which would lift much of the pacifism to a more rational level.

E. J. HUNT.

Olive Cottage, Newport Road,
Cowes, I.W.

CANON SHEPPARD'S CRITICISM OF THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES.

SIR,

In your June number Canon Sheppard makes a statement about the Theological Colleges which in my opinion calls for some comment. On p. 123 he says:—

'So far as they function now, they are incapable of giving the Church a cultured or a charitable ministry. There, with two or three exceptions, impressionable and immature youths are reborn into High or Low churchmanship as completely as W. S. Gilbert's babies in "Iolanthe" were cradled into Conservatism or Liberalism. Some survive, but in spite of rather than because of their surroundings.'

I know four Theological Colleges from within—Ely, where I was a student; Salisbury, where I have held, and Warminster and Ripon Hall, where I still hold, the office of Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History; I have also some knowledge of six other such colleges.

At Ely, then considered to be the 'highest' of the theological colleges, the Principal (Canon Randolph, of happy memory) never tried to impose his own views on me, though I made no pretension to being a high churchman. At Salisbury and Warminster the Principals, had they wished to impose high churchmanship on the students, would not have asked a broad-low or Latitudinarian clergyman to lecture on Church history.

In reply to the charge of making 'impressionable and immature youths' into ecclesiastical partisans, many of those 'youths' are partisans before they enter the colleges, where the authorities even try (sometimes with some success) to help them to a broader view of the Church of England and its ministry.

No doubt some ordinands are incapable of becoming either cultured or charitable ministers. Probably most Principals would prevent their ordination if they could do so; but it is difficult to keep out of the ministry such unpleasing candidates if they have a good moral character and have passed the General Ordination Examination. Such candidates, however, are (so far as my experience goes) in a minority.

There may even now be some colleges which deserve Canon Sheppard's criticisms, but I have no personal experience of them.

Canon Sheppard adds that if he were dictator of the Church of England he would 'remove any Principal who thought it his duty to imbue his students with his own extreme views, whether High or Low.' The dictator would doubtless be just in the application of his own test; I venture to think that most of the existing Principals would have to be left undisturbed.

The passage criticised in this letter occurs in a sermon which otherwise made a favourable impression on at least one of those who heard it. Like Canon Sheppard, I also wish that the Established Church were more 'vital and comprehensive' than it is now. But a comprehensive church must include High and Low churchmen as well as those who are 'liberal' or who claim to be above all parties. The training of the clergy of such a church requires theological colleges of various types; some ordinands develop best in the freedom of Westcott House or Ripon Hall; some are grateful for the more rigid rules of life prescribed at such colleges as Ely; some need to have their fitness for the ministry tested by the iron discipline of Kelham. I would add that there is a place for yet another kind of college (which does not at present exist), a place where men who do not feel sure whether they could fit into the life of a parish clergyman can get some experience of that life before committing themselves to ordination.

Probably the Principals of all the colleges known to me would agree that improvements are needed in the selection, training, and subsequent placing of those who aspire to the ministry, but the wholesale charge that the colleges cannot supply a cultured or a charitable ministry seems to me to be an example of that bitter and unfair criticism which sometimes proceeds from the mouth not only of the priest but also of the prophet. Such fault-finding does not make for that vitality and comprehensiveness which many of us desire as earnestly as the preacher of this otherwise attractive sermon.

J. F. Clayton.

Goldsmith Building, The Temple.
June 20th, 1935.

A PARSON IN REVOLT.

Sir,

It ill becomes a young Modernist to join issue with the Rev. Hubert Handley, a justly respected veteran in the cause of liberalism in the Church of England. Yet, in the present discussion, it would seem that the truth lies rather with Mr. Bramley. His complaints are not so widely different in spirit from those of Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, and his story rings true. He served his first curacy under a rigid traditionalist who, so he tells us, did not hesitate to use the age-long weapon of an accusation of heresy against him. Mr. Handley takes him to task, but one would wish to know a good deal more of the story before allowing this rebuke to pass unchallenged. In these days, titles to ordination are none too easy to procure, and it is not always possible for the Modernist to secure work under a like-minded incumbent, the advice which Mr. Handley gives. A heresy hunt was raised, and Mr. Bramley apparently did not receive the benefit of that broad comprehensiveness which is the boast of the Church of England. It it not enough for Mr. Handley to retort that the Church is steadily broadening and to support his statement by citing several great names as examples of this process. The traditionalist and the obscurantist are still very much with us and are in strategic positions. Let Mr. Handley, or anybody else, give utterance to the recent results of theological scholarship in the pulpits

of a good many of our churches and he will soon find himself suffering the same fate as that of Mr. Bramley. Let him speak his mind upon the many social ills which cry out for remedy—slums, heavy armaments, unemployment and the like — and he will bring upon himself the reproaches of the faithful and the threat of withdrawal of subscriptions. I do not suggest for a moment that the Bishop would be unjust or would listen to gossip, but his position in the parish would be made so uncomfortable by nominally Christian people that he would be glad to be quit of it! I expect that Mr. Handley would tell me that the fights of Stewart Headlam belong to 'old unhappy far-off things and battles long ago'; but Headlam's fate could be paralleled in more recent history. Our rebellious author is certainly guilty of confusing Christ and ecclesiasticism, but there he is making the exact confusion which has sway in the churches to-day. A criticism of the state of the churches is read as a criticism of the religion of Jesus. The man in the pew cannot allow this. He complains that his faith is shaken! Outraged obscurantists gather round to administer comfort to his wounded soul. It is of importance that the father of the family of five who Sunday by Sunday prays into his top-hat, to cite Mr. Hardwick, should be pacified and restored to the family pew. Apparently it does not matter that another weapon has been added to the armoury of Mr. C. E. M. Joad or of the disciples of Karl Marx.

It is the average comfortable layman who is responsible for so much of the trouble. He wants a safe guide to the next world, vulgarly known as a 'sky-pilot.' He is presented with a man who believes enough of the New Testament to urge that its fulfilment includes the striving for the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth and who looks upon his office as that of a leader in a creative democracy. It matters not that he can support his attitude by an appeal to so conservative a theologian as the Dean of Exeter. He has challenged the mental outlook and the pietism of about two centuries ago, the nearest approach to actuality which some of our congregations reach. When 'other helpers fail and comforts flee,' the forces of Mammon will be brought in to make him suffer, and subscriptions will be cut off. We often grumble about the lack of ideals which marks some of the clergy. We must blame the laity, for, after all, it is the demand which creates the supply. Leaving apart small and earnest groups of young people, together with a certain number of more mature years, the average layman does not want a parson who will shake him out of his composure and wound his conscience. He wants somebody who will pat him on the back and provide him with a popular oratory which will flatter his spiritual pride. When the perennial discussion as to why ninety-five per cent. of the population never attend any place of worship is being considered, this avenue is at least worth exploring.

It ill becomes one so inexperienced as myself to suggest remedies, but I should like to make a few suggestions. The methods of the totalitarian state are not suited to the Church of England. We must fight against them. There is too much standardization, too much centralization, too much conforming of the clergy to a type. We must demand a place for the religious individualist. The seeker for truth, theological or social, has his place in a church which claims to be a creative society. Breadth and vision are needed if these dry bones are to be made to live. We have still to find a place where we can seek to make these contributions without suffering the fate of Mr. Bramley or, at least, securing for ourselves the black looks of not a few congregations. Once we acquiesce in the fascist spirit within the Church, once we have clergy who are all schooled in the art of being safe and inoffensive to everybody, our fate is sealed. It is to secure a think-

ing clergy that I would urge a better educated clergy who are in touch with the various phases of modern culture, and who would not allow those of the laity who have no desire to see the Church taking its rightful place in the modern world to teach them their work or to dictate demands.

I know that in a discussion of this type it is usual to blame everybody except the man in the pew. Yet, in the long run, it is he who forces clergy to be safe and to reduce the fervid Gospel of Christ to a mere ethic of respectability. The only solution is to suppress anyone who thus seeks to hamper, to regard the Church as a creative institution, and to demand the safeguards of its comprehensiveness for the seeker after truth. But it is possible to conceive of circumstances where the rebel spirit is the sole means by which this end can be attained. Canon Sheppard has avowed himself as impatient, in other words as rebellious, and his feeling is shared by not a few.

It is a sad fact for the liberal clergy that many of their staunchest supporters stand aloof from organized religion. The reason to be sought is not far off when one regards so many conventional professing Christians. When one hears such a story as that of Mr. Bramley, one is forced to the conclusion that Fr. Tyrrell was right when, in like circumstances, he said that he would rather be judged by God than by His servants!

F. H. Amphlitt Micklewright.

Hulme Hall, Victoria Park,
Manchester, 14.
22nd June, 1935.

Sir,

Mr. Hubert Handley in the June issue of the *Modern Churchman* has given to Mr. Bramley counsels of perfection. I am sure that Mr. Handley is right. I am equally sure that counsels of perfection are futile. I too have lived through Mr. Bramley's experiences, lived through them and come through. I can now agree with Mr. Handley.

But, just as a fortunate meeting with an examining chaplain did so much for Mr. Bramley, I owe almost everything to my first Bishop and my first Vicar. Both of these seemed to have blood running in their veins in place of the correct ecclesiastical chemical . Had they been other than they were (and are) I tremble to think what my end might have been.

But it is Mr. Bramley and not Mr. Handley who has written the article which matters. Some few of us get through. But others go down, are driven into schism, or lapse into dullness and discontent, even into materialism. It is not possible for men in the twenties to have Mr. Handley's larger view, nor is it their function. I doubt if they are even capable of choosing the right Vicar as Mr. Handley suggests. After all, they have some right to assume that Vicars should be interested in the things that matter. The plain fact of the matter is that the Church is losing the Mr. Bramleys, or not getting them. This is just what Mr. Hardwick worked out so clearly in his *Open Letter*.

Those who find themselves in the grip of the machine and who refuse to accept such cogship usually get out of it into Service Chaplaincies, Missions to Seamen, I.C.F., Toc H, and such movements where the spirit of Christ seems to be more at home.

All very good work of course. But can the Church afford to go on like this?

J. E. E. Tunstall,
Toc H Staff.

GOSPEL CRITICISM.

SIR,

Your article on 'Gospel Criticism' is interesting and good so far as it goes, but it invites criticism on some points.

The revelation of the glory of God and of His character as shown in Jesus Christ is only one of the glories of Christianity. A second is the work done on His behalf by the Incarnate Son showing it to be a religion of Redemption, and it is this feature, surely, which has done more than anything else to make it accepted as the biggest and best world-religion.

The Higher Criticism has, as you say, freed men from the burden of accepting the Christ of Dogma and has given them the Jesus of History with His much more human gospel. But you hardly do justice to the very latest phase of criticism, a phase which we may call Schweitzerism. Dr. Schweitzer is a historian as well as a theologian, and has increased the means of historical criticism by the study of the Apocalyptic books and their application to the Synoptic Gospels, with the result that he offers a quite new interpretation of the narrative, which is not yet accepted, it is true, as it will be a generation hence. But, as you rightly point out, his interpretation and the later one of Professor Lightfoot end in the same conclusion, *viz.* that Jesus is a *persona incognita*. But does that justify you speaking of the earthly Christ and the heavenly Christ, as if they were two persons who are ultimately identical, or at least two aspects, and very different ones, of the same person who is commonly called Jesus Christ?

For has not Dr. Schweitzer, if read without any bias produced by traditional theology, proved that Jesus of Nazareth cannot be described as being somehow or other a heavenly Christ? Christ is, after all, only the Greek translation of Messiah, and to be the Jewish Messiah Jesus did claim (see *Mk.* xiv, 61 *f.*), though not yet revealed as such. He was sure, however, that He would be recognized as that pre-existent, semi-divine Being when the Messianic kingdom was revealed.

Meanwhile, as Dr. Schweitzer shows, He was only a man (*cf. Acts* ii, 20*f.*), and suffered a real human death for blasphemy. He only became Jesus, the Christ, after and through the conversion of St. Paul, who was persecuting those who believed in His apparently blasphemous claim, but was converted to that same belief before he left Damascus. He did not wait, however, to ask whether that claim had been proved, as Jesus had promised to prove it by appearing on the clouds of heaven with super-human power and authority.

It was such a Being, pre-existent with the Father, whom St. Paul expected as the saviour of the world (*Phil.* ii, 5-11), and he was sure that Jesus, the Christ, was that Being. To become that saviour he had to humble Himself even to the death on the cross, and St. Paul is so overwhelmed by the love shown to him by this Messiah, and by the influence exerted by Him on his life (*Gal.* ii, 20), that he calls Him with all confidence and without any qualification the Son of God.

May one not ask how the Christ of Dogma is to be made identical with the Jesus of History? The former is surely the Pauline figure whom the great apostle believed on the strength of his personal experience to be the world's Saviour; and Christian tradition has followed his lead, believing in a Son of God who, like St. Paul's Messiah or Christ, 'for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven.'

I have discussed the whole question more fully in a book, *From Christianity to Spiritualism*, believing that spiritualism is now so firmly established as genuine and helpful that we may use the knowledge obtained

through it to help us in clearing our ideas of the present and the future of religion. Indeed, I venture to say that we not only may use it, but that we ought to do so. The *Spirit Teachings* of Stainton Moses are a reservoir of such enlightening and helpful knowledge.

May I adapt and adopt part of your concluding paragraph? Science may alter our idea of God, and spiritualism may forbid us to believe in a Saviour who will save us from the just penalty of our sins. But no new belief can take away from us the Divine Spirit, who is not only transcendent but indwelling also, enabling us to respond to his messages and to render ourselves capable of receiving ever increasing influxes of light, and love, and power, as every sort of Christian believes at present, and has always believed.

C. T. CAMPION, M.A.

48 Manor Park, Bristol 6.

MY PUZZLE.

SIR,

The answer to 'my puzzle' in the May issue supplies another puzzle, for the writer says 'the essential truth (of the Resurrection) is the doctrine that Jesus triumphed over death,' and this he calls a 'fact' and contrasts it with a 'method': the 'method' of the Resurrection being introduced in order to leave the empty tomb an open question.

But then here is the puzzle. Did Peter, six weeks after his Master's death, preach this 'fact' of His triumph over death while death was triumphing over His Body?

Would the Modernist perhaps say the Resurrection is a 'value' and not a fact at all? But how about Peter?

C. M. THOMPSON, Ph.D. (Toronto).

6 Park Road, Haslemere.
Whit-Sunday.

There are no doubt some Modernists who would regard the 'value of the Resurrection' as a more accurate phrase to describe their view of it than the 'fact of the Resurrection.' Arthur Clough's poem, 'Christ is Risen,' would seem to place him in that class. On the other hand, many Modernists would prefer the 'fact of the Resurrection,' for they hold that the Resurrection was an objective fact, not merely a subjective experience, although they would find it impossible to describe the objective fact.

We take it that our correspondent recognizes that it is quite possible to affirm belief in a fact, *e.g.* a murder, without being able to affirm belief in the manner or mode of its accomplishment. Had we used the phrase 'truth of the Resurrection,' or 'reality of the Resurrection,' perhaps that would have gratified our correspondent. We are able as Modernists to affirm the fact, truth, reality and value of the Resurrection, but must assert that our difficulty, in view of the conflicting evidence, is concerned with the mode of the Resurrection.

Our correspondent does not seem to realize that *Acts* i and ii is in conflict with *John* xx. The narrative in *John* xx presupposes that the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, and the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Apostles (Insufflation) all took place on the first Easter Day. The Johannine narrative receives support from the following passage in the Epistle of Barnabas: 'Wherefore also we keep the eighth day for rejoicing, in the which also Jesus rose from the dead, and having been manifested ascended into the heavens' (ch. xv). According to the learned Bishop Lightfoot, the Epistle of Barnabas was written between 70 A.D. and 132 A.D., *i.e.* before the *Acts of the Apostles*.

Investigation does not decrease the number of the puzzles, but what we should desire is that it should not decrease the number of the Christians. This it may do if the distinction between fact and mode be ignored.—ED., *M.C.*